

Thomas Michael Loomer

THE ANGLICAN MINISTRY

FROM THE LIBRARY
OF THE LATE

Revd. OWEN THOMAS, D. D.

LIVERPOOL.

PURCHASED AND PRESENTED BY

MR WILLIAM THOMAS,

BOOTLE, LIVERPOOL.

TO

THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
BALA.

DECEMBER, 1891.

Ballantyne Press

BALLANTYNE AND HANSON, EDINBURGH
CHANDOS STREET, LONDON

THE
ANGLICAN MINISTRY

*ITS NATURE AND VALUE IN RELATION TO
THE CATHOLIC PRIESTHOOD*

An Essay

BY ARTHUR WOLLASTON HUTTON, M.A.

OF THE ORATORY OF ST. PHILIP NERI

WITH A PREFACE BY

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL NEWMAN

FOUNDER OF THE ENGLISH ORATORY

"Sudantes vos operarios cerno, sed tamen laborare extrà vineam non ignoro"

POPE PELAGIUS II., *to the Schismatical Bishops of Istria*

LONDON

C. KEGAN PAUL & CO., 1, PATERNOSTER SQUARE

1879

P R E F A C E.

THE present volume has been put into my hands, since it was in type, with a request that I would prefix to it a few lines by way of Introduction. This I gladly do not only for the sake of the author, who is a member of this Oratory and my dear friend, but also because the work seems to me an important contribution in the controversy, as it now stands, between the Catholic Church and the Anglican claims. Only I fear lest such interposition on my part as the author wishes, should really be of disservice to his argument, as weakening or confusing its drift.

Thus much, however, is what he tells us himself in his opening pages, that, directly and in the first instance, he is writing against what is called the Ritualistic party. He presses upon its members the following consideration : that, while all Anglicans maintain the Church of England to be an integral part of that great ecclesiastical polity which has lasted from the Apostolic age to the present, the Ritualists, over and above this pretension, hold certain doctrines in detail, which other Anglicans

do not hold, whereby they lay themselves open to an *argumentum ad hominem*, from which Anglicanism, as such, is sheltered: these special doctrines being on the one hand true, and on the other, declaratory of gifts which Ritualists must prove to be theirs before they can lawfully claim them; and this they have not even attempted to do. In other words, whereas each side in the controversy throws the *onus probandi* on the other, Catholics on Anglicans, and Anglicans on Catholics, each having a plausible case for doing so, Ritualists, by their special doctrines, in which the run of Anglicans take no part, certainly do shift the burden of proof on to themselves, as even their fellow-Anglicans would grant; and this is what the present author professes to show *in extenso*, though in no spirit of hostile criticism, but as wishing to carry conviction to honest minds, and being persuaded that, in this case, conviction would be sure to lead to its legitimate and momentous consequences.

I have said that Anglican disputants have a plausible case for refusing to begin the controversy by setting themselves to prove that they belong to the Catholic Church, and for challenging an opponent instead to prove that they do not belong to it. They think it enough to answer such positive arguments as are directly brought against them, and to say just as much as is necessary for tiding over difficulties and nothing more. They feel they need do no more than

point out what they consider flaws in our proof against them, to adduce hypotheses which will blunt or turn aside its force, and possibilities which are not eliminated from it, to complain of the absence of mood and figure in its construction, or, on the contrary, of its formal logical shape when there is opportunity for an accumulation of argument; and they think they may thus fairly keep on the defensive, and would be absurd if they acted otherwise, because, like soldiers behind earthworks, they are in possession.

This is their strong point; they are in possession, and they have the strength of possession, and they leave it to us to turn them out of it. Certainly we cannot deny that Augustine planted the Catholic Church in Anglo-Saxon England, and they say, there it is still, just where it was, Catholic and Anglican, as the Church in France is Catholic and Gallican; one with Gregory the First, as certainly as it is not one with Leo the Thirteenth. They claim to be the veritable continuation of the Ante-Reformation Church, and to represent it, standing "*super antiquas vias*," with the old Sees, the old Churches, the old Chapters, the old property, the old temporal *status*, the old laws and rights, the old Colleges and schools. This broad evidence dispenses with and serves for direct proof, removing withal the chance of serious objections, which it will be quite time to answer when they make their appearance. There was, to be sure, a very trying interval for the Church

of England in the sixteenth century, when it ran great risk of being wrecked; but it weathered the storm, and its good fortune may be regarded as a providence, and becomes a positive argument for its being what its visible pre-eminence and its great history betoken.

Such, I conceive, is in controversy the position of Anglicanism. Its advocates have relied, as a Note of the Church, upon the large presumption in its favour which its prosperity has involved, and have narrowed their actual polemic to a minute handling of formal acts and documents and obscure points bearing on the validity of its Orders, to questions as to the authors and drift of its symbolical Articles, and to other methods so technical and legal as to remind us of the demand of a full pound of flesh in the well-known drama.

Now the volume which I am introducing to the reader, following out the line of argument suggested by Canon Estcourt and others, elevates the controversy to a higher ground. It refuses to be contented with such petty and evasive manœuvres in behalf of Anglicanism, as Catholic disputants have so often put up with, and claims to discuss and to judge of it, not by archæology, but by history and common sense. The main presumption for the Church of England, as I have described it, holds good certainly *primâ facie*, that is, until it is encountered by contrary and more cogent presumptions, but only

till then. Possession, though a strong antecedent reason for supposing that the Anglican Church is a portion of Catholic Christendom, is not a proof of it. It is open to be met by other presumptions, stronger and in their nature more serious. No Anglican, for instance, would maintain that, even though his Church retained all its power and property, it would remain Catholic, supposing it became Unitarian. Inward characteristics carry more weight and may be not less luminous than external properties. The question is, has not the Anglican Hierarchy, has not the English people, in its faith, in its formularies, in its acts, stripped itself of Christian truths and Christian gifts, and (as the Ritualist grants, or rather maintains), such as are essential to the idea of Christianity,—gifts which he has not power now to claim back at his will at the end of three centuries, and which to claim, without tradition to support the claim, is but a confession of their irrecoverable forfeiture?

To this point the author addresses himself. Of course, what he has to allege tells against all Anglicans; but it tells against Ritualists more forcibly, because those very gifts which they claim to share with us Catholics, are maintained by their co-religionists to be, not truths, but corruptions, “blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” But, to claim awful gifts, and to pretend to awful powers, which, if their fellow-Anglicans are to be believed, they have not, is to play with edged-tools; and, inasmuch as our

author believes this to be the case with the religious men in question, as it was once his own case, and in proportion as he feels, from the associations of former years, a sympathy with and a near interest in them, and believes in their honesty, so does he hope that they will give him a patient hearing in a matter which concerns them, as it once concerned himself.

(?) Now, if the Catholic view of the *Sacerdotium*, as residing in the Christian Ministry, be a truth of revelation; if, nevertheless, it is not and never has been held by any Anglican minister, since Anglicanism existed, till the last thirty years; if Anglicans, I say, have neither believed in the existence of such a gift, nor professed to use it, nor taught and honoured it; if, rather they have called it a "blasphemy,"—who shall say, without a great paradox, that suddenly a small minority of the Anglican body is possessed of it, while the main body persists, not simply in ignoring it, or in being ignorant of it, but in knowing it too well as claimed by us Catholics, and denying utterly that such a gift was ever made by our Lord to any one? Sacraments the Church of England has ever claimed, but never Sacrifice. It never, in the Ritualistic, in the Catholic sense of it, has been professed by any Anglican party till now. We know well what is a High Churchman; one who holds the Episcopal form of government, the

Apostolic Succession, and baptismal regeneration, perhaps the Real Presence, not the *Sacerdotium*. Of course all Anglicans, all Protestants, will admit the word "sacrifice" as a synonym of divine worship, and the word "priest" when used as correlative to this "sacrifice;" but what does "sacrifice" thus accepted mean? We cannot ask for a better authority than the very learned, careful, temperate Waterland, perhaps the greatest authority on a question of doctrine among all the Anglican divines, and he in his Treatise on the Eucharist thus writes:—

"That the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in whole or in part, in a sense proper or improper, is a sacrifice of the Christian Church, is a point agreed upon among all knowing and sober divines, Popish, Lutheran or Reformed. But the Romanists have so often and so grievously abused the once innocent names of oblation, sacrifice, propitiation, &c., perverting them to an ill sense, and grafting false doctrine and false worship upon them, that the Protestants have been justly jealous of admitting those names, or scrupulously wary and reserved in the use of them.

. . . . "Mr. Mede, a very learned and judicious divine and Protestant, scrupled not to assert a proper sacrifice in the Eucharist (as he termed it), a material sacrifice, the sacrifice of bread and wine, analogous to the *Mincha* of the Old Law. . . . In the year 1642 the no less learned Dr. Cudworth printed his well-known treatise on the same subject; wherein he as plainly denies any proper or any material sacrifice in the Eucharist, but admits of a symbolical feast upon a sacrifice—that is to say, upon the Grand Sacrifice itself commemorated under certain symbols.

This appears to have been the prevailing doctrine of our divines, both before and since [*i.e.*, down to 1737]. There can be no doubt of the current doctrine down to Mr. Mede [A.D. 1635]; and, as to what has most prevailed since, I need only refer to three very eminent divines, who wrote in the years 1685, 1686, 1688.

. . . . "The service, therefore, of the Eucharist, on the foot of ancient Church language, is both a true and a proper sacrifice, and the noblest that we are capable of offering, when considered as comprehending under it many true and evangelical sacrifices: 1, the sacrifice of alms to the poor, and oblations to the Church not the material offering, but the service; 2, the sacrifice of prayer; 3, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; 4, the sacrifice of a penitent and contrite heart; 5, the sacrifice of ourselves; 6, the offering of the mystical Body of Christ, that is, his Church; 7, the offering up of true converts or sincere penitents to God by their pastors; 8, the sacrifice of faith and hope and self-humiliation in commemorating the Grand Sacrifice.

"From hence likewise may we understand in what sense the officiating authorised ministers perform the office of proper evangelical priests in this service. They do it in three ways: 1, as commemorating in solemn form the same sacrifice here below, which Christ our High Priest commemorates above; 2, as handing up those prayers and those services of Christians to Christ our Lord, who, as High Priest, recommends the same in heaven to God the Father; 3, as offering up to God all the faithful. . . . In these three ways the Christian officers are priests or liturgs." *

* Waterland's Works, vol. vii. pp. 341-350. Oxford, 1823.

Catholics, then, and the Ritualists hold that in the Holy Eucharist, the Gospel priest offers Christ in His Body and Blood for the living and the dead, and that, by virtue of such offering, he is a priest. Is there not an infinite difference between such a *Sacerdotium* and that which Waterland, in the name of the succession of Anglican divines, claims as Christian and true? If all those writers have abjured and rejected it down to 1737, the date of his Treatise, may we not go on to say that they have repudiated it from 1737 down to 1830 or 1840? Whence, then, did Ritualists get so marvellous a gift? Did Episcopacy include it? Then must Anglican ordainers have intended to communicate it. Is it included in the form of ordination? Then, where are the words which declare it? Surely, it is too momentous, too awful a gift, to be transmitted in silence. It constitutes a new religion. It is the formal cause, the constituting rite of the Catholic Church: where it is not, there is no Church. How can the gift be real, and its profession, its use, its application, not essential? How can a religious communion which teaches, which observes so wonderful an act, be one and the same communion with a body which disowns it?

If you do not like Waterland, find for us some one else, who will give you some sort of countenance in your straits. Who in the question of the *Sacerdotium* rises higher than Mede, Bull, Johnson, and Hickes,

as explaining the Eucharist to be a material sacrifice of bread and wine? or than Waterland, and many more, in considering it a spiritual sacrifice of the heart? or than Waterland again, Cudworth, Sharp, and others, in accepting it as a symbolical present feast upon the past proper and real Sacrifice on Calvary? What Anglican opponent of Anabaptists, Presbyterians, or Wesleyans, ever claimed to offer Christ for the living and the dead? Who of such theologians did not believe a doctrine like this to be a bad superstition? What Anglican Bishop has ordained with the intention of imparting the gift, as Ritualists understand it? Would not every one of them have promptly repudiated such an intention, had he been asked on the point? Would he not have granted that, supposing the Catholic *Sacerdotium* was an Anglican doctrine, the Anglican Church was no place for him? and that, supposing it was the true doctrine, there was no *locus standi* for the Anglican Church? If I mention names in illustration, it is in no disrespect towards the owners of them, for some of them were personal friends of mine, whom I loved and valued, but because, as being High Churchmen beyond others, and yet not dreaming that they possessed this gift, they present the most telling contrast with the professions and observances of the Ritualists. Such are, or were, Dr. Ogilvie, Mr. Hugh Rose, Dr. Lyall, Dr. Hook, Dr. Faussett, Mr. John Miller, Bishop Selwyn,

Bishop Wordsworth. Such were Bishop Bethell, Bishop Van Mildert, Bishop Mant, Dr. Routh, and Dr. Collinson. In the foregoing century High Churchmen were scarce; but did such pious and strict men as Bishop Horne and Jones of Nayland, did philosophers as Butler and Berkeley, hold the doctrine of the *Sacerdotium*, or perform its characteristic rite, as the Ritualists do now? To go back still further, will not Hickes and Johnson, to whom Waterland refers, fairly represent the theology of the Non-jurors, and was not the greatest altitude of thought in Hickes and Johnson the sacrifice, not of a victim, but of material bread and wine? Did Beveridge or Bull, Taylor or Hammond, Pearson or Barrow ever deny that "the sacrifices of masses, in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt" were *blasphemia figmenta* or *perniciosæ imposturæ*? Was the creed of Bramhall, Laud, Field, and Jackson, more averse to so stringent an anathema? As I am mainly pursuing the negative argument, I will not fall back upon the sixteenth century, into which the author drives the objects of his attack, and in which his negative argument, as derived from the history of the times, becomes positive, and tells against Anglicans generally, as well as against what is called "the advanced party."

I have confined myself here to the negative argument, and as it lies against the Ritualistic claim. I

will conclude with two remarks :—First, that although the ninetieth “ Tract for the Times ” did not even go so far as to advocate the *Sacerdotium* in the Catholic sense, but only the possibility of interpreting the thirty-first Article in a sense short of its denial, Dr. Routh told the Bishop of Oxford, who consulted him on the point, that such interpretations generally as those advocated in the Tract were a simple novelty in Anglican history ; and, secondly, that, though in that Tract the liberty to hold it, consistently with the wording of the thirty-first Article, was undoubtedly maintained, still, as far as my memory goes, neither the writer of the Tract, nor his friends, distinctly held the Catholic doctrine themselves. From the first they believed the Eucharist to be a sacrifice ; but the mode of the Eucharistic Presence and Sacrifice they did not determine. Certainly I myself did not hold Transubstantiation. I had begun the movement with vague incomplete views, which cleared as I went on, but were not definite and consistent till I joined the Catholic Church.

JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN.

THE ORATORY, BIRMINGHAM,

September, 1879.

CONTENTS.

	PAG
PREFACE	v—xvi

INTRODUCTORY.

SECTION

1. An objection to the opportuneness of the proposed discussion anticipated	1
2. Belief in Anglican Orders a hindrance to conversion .	6
3. The question of Orders not of primary importance .	12
4. Scope of the proposed discussion	25

PRIMÂ FACIE EVIDENCE.

5. Limitation of the discussion to the extreme High Church claim	33
6. The distinctive marks of sacerdotal and of non-sacerdotal "Churches"	40
7. Application of the preceding criterion to the case of the Church of England	44
8. The origin and early history of Anglicanism inconsistent with the High Church estimate of Anglican Orders	49
9. The fortunes of Anglicanism since the sixteenth century also inconsistent with the sacerdotal theory of Anglican Orders	55
10. Contrast of the modern claim, especially as asserted in practice	64
11. The Anglican custody of the Eucharist; a reply to the argument considered	69
12. Alleged witness of the modern revival to the validity of Anglican Orders	76

SECTION	PAGE
13. <i>Primâ facie</i> evidence of the character of the Anglican Episcopate	82
14. Summary of the <i>primâ facie</i> evidence	89
HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.	
15. The question of Anglican Ordinations until the death of Queen Mary	95
16. The establishment of the Elizabethan Hierarchy . .	108
17. Uniformity of the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the recipients of Anglican Orders . . .	122
18. Alleged recognition of Anglican Orders by the Council of Trent, and by Popes Pius IV. and Innocent XII.	128
19. Preliminary remarks to the discussion of the theo- logical evidence	141
20. <i>Primâ facie</i> evidence furnished by the Anglican Ordinal	145
21. Principles by which to judge the sufficiency of an ordination rite	152
22. Application of the above principles to the Anglican Ordinal	165
23. The question of sufficient intention	172
THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.	
I.	
24. The Catholic doctrine of the Christian Priesthood .	185
II.	
25. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice	191
III.	
26. The Real Presence, and Sacraments in General . .	199
IV.	
27. The Sacrament of Penance	208
V.	
28. The retention of the term "Priest"	226

CONTENTS.

xix

SECTION

PAGE

VI.

29.	The rejection of the term "Altar." Summary . . .	240
30.	Contrast between the Catholic and Anglican rites for ordaining a priest	244
31.	Further examination of the Anglican rite for the ordination of a priest	251
32.	The alleged parallel of the Abyssinian form	259
33.	Another parallel to the composition of the Anglican form	266
34.	Courayer's defence of the Anglican Ordinal	270
35.	Conclusion on the Anglican rite for ordaining a priest	278
36.	The Anglican rite for Episcopal consecration	284
37.	The Anglican Church and the Sacrament of Holy Order	294
38.	The question of the consecration of William Barlow	303
39.	The coöperation of the assistant Bishops at a consecration	319
40.	The consecration of Matthew Parker	334
41.	Character of the original Anglican claim to an Apostolical Succession	346
42.	Anglican Orders in the seventeenth century	356
43.	Sketch of the controversy as conducted by Catholics	365
44.	The question of Anglican baptisms	374
45.	The present position of the controversy	379

CONCLUSION.

46.	The plausibility of the Anglican claim	391
47.	Prejudice the mainstay of the Anglican claim	405
48.	A return to the <i>primâ facie</i> evidence	414
49.	Gravity of the responsibilities involved in the maintenance of the extreme High Church claim	430
50.	A last word	444

APPENDIX.

NOTE	PAGE
I. The alleged disloyalty of Ritualism	449
II. The " Order of Corporate Reunion "	453
III. Indefectibility of the Church's unity	458
IV. The Anglican Church and heresy	460
V. Conditional Ordination	469
VI. Anglicanism and corporate reunion	471
VII. The continuity of the Church of England	477
VIII. The Catholic doctrine of Holy Order	484
IX. The significance of the " Ornaments Rubric "	492
X. Anglican Jurisdiction	497
XI. Anglicanism and the regulation of confession	511
XII. The testimony of the English martyrs	514
XIII. Cardinal Newman's argument	517
XIV. The Eastern Churches and Anglicanism	523
XV. The internal disunion of the Anglican Church	537
XVI. A Table of the Anglican Succession	540
<hr/>	
INDEX	545

THE ANGLICAN MINISTRY.

I.

INTRODUCTORY.

§ 1. *An Objection to the Opportuneness of the Proposed Discussion Anticipated.*

IT appears to be generally admitted that the struggle between faith and unbelief, which has existed in all ages with more or less intensity, is likely before very long to be renewed in our own country (if indeed it can be said to have been ever abandoned) with great and increasing severity. It may be counted therefore inopportune, if not altogether unwise, for those who are in the main on the same side in the encounter to join issue among themselves on minor, and such as are deemed unessential, points. "Why not sink our differences," it may be asked, "and unite, on the ground of our common Christianity, to meet the common foe?"

But in truth such an alliance, though it might have some temporary effect, would not in the end really lead to victory. It would be a compromise, and therefore without principle. Catholics at least could not for a moment consent to what would be a practical denial of the unity of the truth and of the supremacy of its claims. The Catholic Church would not be faithful to her divine mission if she were timidly to ally herself with those who, in the event of victory, would only seek to complete it (from their own point of view) by her destruction.

It is not denied that, under certain circumstances, a so-called Rationalist may be able to influence in the direction of faith those who are wholly alien from the Church, better than the Catholic controversialist, who is further removed, can do. And in like manner the Rationalist may more readily listen to the Protestant, the mere Protestant to the Anglican, and so on, until the threshold of the Church is reached ; while the Church's own authorised teachers would have preached to deaf ears in vain. Education, culture, wealth, and political *status* may contribute much to the success of these pioneers of the faith ; whose work, however (so far as it is constructive and sound), is simply to point unconsciously towards the Church, while she patiently awaits the submission of both teachers and taught to her authority, as to that of the living revelation of God upon earth.

While then she cannot consistently unite with any who are not of her fold, she holds no controversy with them so long as they do not attack her doctrine, nor falsely claim her powers. Unwillingly they do her work, anxious rather to supplant than to aid her ; but sooner or later the fruit is hers, and in the long-run it is found that she alone, possessing the fulness and unity of truth, is able, as even her enemies angrily confess, to stand firm amidst the ceaseless beating of the waves of unbelief ; for she is founded on the Rock, and alone can claim the divine promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.

Now it would appear that just in the way indicated above, the Providence of Almighty God is preparing at this time to strengthen the Church against the violence of the coming attack. All the world over His grace is influencing and arousing the various non-Catholic communities, and in spite of themselves they are tending in the direction of Rome ; or, to speak more accurately, many thousands of

their members are moving this way ; for contemporaneously thousands of others, and not a few from the Catholic Church as well, are drifting towards the opposite camp, and are swelling the ranks of that army, which must sooner or later make a fierce and final onslaught on the City of God.

This period of movement towards the Catholic Church has not lately begun, nor does it appear likely soon to be completed. In England perhaps the first sign was the fervour of the Wesleyan revival, a hundred and more years ago. Then followed the piety and philanthropy of the Evangelical school. But neither of these pointed so clearly in the direction of Catholicism as did the ecclesiastical principles of Tractarianism, now some fifty years old. So soon as their legitimate end was clearly perceived, the tide of conversions began. And the last twenty years have seen a further development of this remarkable revival, which would appear now to have reached its nearest possible approximation to Catholicism, though its influence may, and probably will, extend.

Ritualism furnishes a fair number of converts to the Church, and so fulfils its providential mission. But the number is comparatively small, when it is remembered how nearly Catholic are the principles it professes, and how all but the Ritualists themselves see clearly that submission to Rome is for them simply a matter of consistency. Indeed, it is notorious that many, perhaps very many persons, guided by this movement, which confessedly is changing the whole religious aspect of the country, reach the very threshold of the Catholic Church and wait there, may be for years, in doubt and perplexity. Some hindrance blocks the way, and they fail to enter. And then, for the most part, since they do not plant their feet upon the Rock, they slowly but surely drift away into a thinly-disguised Liberalism, and in the end may even be found with those

who are altogether hostile to faith. This is no imaginary picture, but the religious history of hundreds in the present day.

What is the cause of this shipwreck of faith? How comes it that, after zeal has been aroused and prejudices have been removed, grace is bestowed in vain just when its victory seemed assured? Some would trace the failure to the alleged uninviting aspect of the modern Catholic Church. Others would say it was due to an imperfect grasp of true principles. Others again, with justice, would maintain that what promised so well came to nothing in this or that particular case in consequence of personal faults in the individual, whether it were culpable ignorance, or shallowness, or deeply-engrained prejudice, or captiousness, or fear of the sharp and contemptuous words of others. Perhaps many instances of non-conversion may be thus accounted for, but by no means all; and the present writer is convinced that the obstacle, which more than any other hinders submission to the Roman Catholic Church, is an honest, though (as he thinks he will be able to show) mistaken belief in the reality of the Anglican Priesthood.

If this view be correct, it follows that the discussion proposed in these pages is most opportune, and is demanded both by justice and charity. The attempt to show that Anglican Orders cannot safely be accounted valid is no unprovoked attack on a position which Catholics might be willing to regard as indifferent, or even as auxiliary to their own cause. If conversions are hindered by the persuasion that all sacramental grace may be obtained within the Church of England as securely as within the Church of Rome, it becomes the duty of those who are confident that such a persuasion is a mistake, to give their reasons for so thinking; and indeed to keep silence, when there is the opportunity to speak, may be to risk the loss of souls.

Moreover, if it be true (and Catholics are not alone in affirming it) that only faith founded on the Rock of Peter will be able to stand against those assaults of infidelity which the coming age will see, it follows that an argument, which at first sight may seem only calculated to cause needless division, and to pain those whom the writer would not wantonly pain, may nevertheless be in the end conducive to the truest unity, and tend to the establishment of faith on a sure basis, by indicating the mistaken action of men who would devote their time and talents to the formation out of unfit materials of an Anglo-Catholic Church, one day (as they dream) to be united to the rest of Christendom; and thus this Essay, by calling attention to the absence of any substantial foundation for such a scheme, may facilitate the entrance into the "one fold under one shepherd" of those who were in danger of spending their strength on attractive but visionary undertakings, but who, within the Roman Catholic Church, will find their position secure and their work permanent.

Such then in brief are the reasons for maintaining the opportuneness, from the Catholic point of view, of an attempt to disprove the reality of the Anglican Priesthood. That all lovers of justice and order, whether Catholics or no, have a further reason for desiring anyhow that the controversy should be decided one way or the other, and may therefore reasonably welcome the present attempt at its solution, is a point referred to below.* Before, however, the discussion is actually begun, the position of these men, who are asserted to be hindered from making their submission to Rome in consequence of their belief in Anglican Orders, must be more clearly ascertained.

* See in the Appendix, Note I., on "The Alleged Disloyalty of Ritualism."

§ 2. *Belief in Anglican Orders a Hindrance to Conversion.*

Within the last forty years a considerable number of Protestants* have so far departed from the traditions of their fathers as to have learned with tolerable accuracy, and to have embraced with enthusiasm, the great Catholic truths concerning the nature of the Christian Ministry and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. That their apprehension of these truths is to some extent inadequate and incorrect will be seen later. Nevertheless, the doctrines on these subjects now proclaimed from hundreds of Anglican pulpits, or laid down with precision in numerous widely-circulated devotional manuals, are far nearer the truth than anything that Protestants have hitherto taught. And truth has a power of its own, and carries conviction with it, although it be imperfectly presented, and even when what is pointed to as its realisation is little better than a parody of it. Moreover, when these doctrines are urged with no little learning and unction by men of whose personal goodness and honesty

* Perhaps in the present day some apology is needed for including Anglicans under the general term "Protestant." A considerable number repudiate the title, and it does not occur in the Prayer-Book, nor has the Anglican Church ever applied it to herself; although the State, with which she is intimately connected, commonly gives this designation to the Anglican religion in Acts of Parliament, without any protest on her part; and it is thus used by her chief minister on so solemn an occasion as the Coronation of the Sovereign. Nevertheless, seeing that the essence of Protestantism lies in the rejection of the Pope's authority, and that by the common usage of three centuries all the religious bodies, including the Church of England, which owe their separate existence to the Reformation, have been regularly described as Protestant, there seems to be no just reason why the term should now be restricted to its original historical signification, and not be applied to those who still reject the Pope's authority, though they continually accept more and more of his doctrines. Indeed, there is no other generic term that Catholics can conveniently and consistently use; nor would any one have objected to their application of the word until quite recent times. Laud and Cosin were extreme High Churchmen in their day, but they described themselves and their Church as "Protestant."

there can, generally speaking, be no doubt, what wonder if they gain many devoted adherents? The very fact that the truths in question are comparatively new to both preachers and hearers gives them a further attractiveness; for the eloquent expounder of them in an Anglican pulpit seems almost to bear the character of a prophet of a new and fuller revelation. Catholics have no controversy with these teachers so long as they confine themselves to doctrine, and simply insist on the true nature of the Sacraments of Holy Order, of Penance, or of the Holy Eucharist, which they have gathered from some Catholic treatise; but it is when they apply what they have learnt to the office and work of Anglican clergymen (as indeed they can hardly help doing) that Catholics feel bound to protest; for they are convinced that it is an application of true principles to a mistaken view of facts, than which nothing is more misleading.

That hundreds of persons, in all other respects ripe for conversion, have withheld their submission to the Roman Church simply because, after having embraced the Catholic doctrines concerning Priesthood, Sacraments and Sacrifice, they have been persuaded that the Anglican clergyman is by virtue of his Orders empowered to effect the Real Presence and to absolve from sin, is a statement that the writer does not fear to make from his own knowledge, and from what he has learnt from others. If misgivings concerning the nature of the Anglican Priesthood, as was not unlikely, assailed them, they consulted their High Church "director," and he told them so positively that on that point at least there could be no possible doubt, that they felt bound to yield assent, having no means at hand to test the matter for themselves. Perhaps, in spite of their misgivings, they rather wished to believe what they heard. Especially might this be the case if they looked forward to

being admitted to the Priesthood themselves. How tempting to find the dignity and mysterious powers of the Catholic priest attainable without the long and painful preparation commonly exacted by the Catholic Church ; without her vexatious restrictions of the obligation to celibacy, to the recitation of the Divine Office, and to unquestioning obedience to ecclesiastical superiors ! How pleasant to have merely to pass through the few and easy preliminaries to two Anglican ordinations, and then to wear a Roman collar and a chasuble, to say Mass and to hear confessions, yielding obedience to no possible authority, and even claiming to be regarded as a martyr if a long course of insubordination is checked ! And so they willingly are persuaded that the High Church claim is just, and they silence the inward voice that bids them go to Rome if they desire honestly to believe and put into practice the truths that they have learned. They will not abandon the Church of their baptism,* nor be unfaithful to the inheritance they have received from their fathers. They are convinced that to leave the Church of England (in spite of much therein which they confess is unsatisfactory), would be to betray a sacred trust, and to despise the gifts of God. And so they remain, receive Anglican Orders, act the priest for a time, and year by year harden their consciences by continued opposition to the authorities they are called upon to obey, and by forced interpretation in their own sense, if not by evasion, of the formularies they are bound to use.† After a while they see perhaps that

* “Nemo dicat, Illum sequar quoniam ipse me Christianum fecit ; aut, Illum sequar quoniam ipse me baptizavit. . . . Nullus prædicans nomen Christi, et gestans ac ministrans Sacramentum Christi, sequendum est contrà unitatem Christi.”—St. Aug., *Cont. litt. Petil.*, lib. iii. cap. 5.

† This is not of course to be taken as a fair description of all those who take part in the Ritualistic movement, though it is true enough of a certain number. Many are devout and transparently sincere men, anxious only to

they had been too confident about the Anglican Priesthood ; but the discovery does not disconcert them. Their attitude towards Catholicism is no longer what it was in former years. They fancy they can now see a number of serious objections to the rule of Rome. Moreover, they think they are surrounded by weighty responsibilities, and that they would do wrong to retire from their work. In fact, they have quietly laid aside many of the Catholic principles which had once brought them so near the Church. They are Ritualists still in externals but Broad Churchmen at heart ; and they are convinced that anyhow, whether they be priests or no, they have nothing to gain from the Pope ; and so they remain to the end at least materially outside the Fold of Christ.

Such cases as these, and they exist, surely warrant the assertion made above, that charity demands that the reasons which satisfy Catholics of the nullity of Anglican Orders should at least be within the reach of those who, at the crisis of their spiritual life, are only hindered from making their submission to the Vicar of Christ by their persuasion that the Anglican clergyman is a priest, and that through him they can obtain all the sacramental graces which they acknowledge as necessary for their salvation. It is mainly to such persons that this Essay is addressed. The writer is well aware that, however sound his reasoning, it will not convince, but only irritate, those who have long ago made up their minds on the subject, who refuse even to listen to what Catholics have to say, and who regard the very mooted of the question as an impertinence. Such

know and obey the truth ; but, in spite of their own better selves, they are driven into a position involving inconsistencies and even insubordination, as the only logical outcome of their mistaken view of what the Church of England really is. That the pages which follow may be of service to such as these is what the writer especially desires.

persons as these have so thoroughly saturated themselves with Ritualistic principles and prejudices that a Catholic would do nothing towards their conversion even if he should succeed in demonstrating to them that their Orders are null. The bare persuasion that Anglican priests are probably only laymen is by itself but a sorry disposition for submission to the Catholic Church. It is not therefore to such as these that the writer addresses himself, for he would not have accomplished what he desires, even should they admit the force of his reasoning. The removal of difficulties, and not the mere suggestion of doubts, is what he has in view.

Moreover, he is aware that the High Church newspaper critics, if they notice him at all, will do so only to declare that his objections to the reality of the Anglican Priesthood are contemptible, and "not worth the paper on which they are printed ;" or will even roundly accuse him of conscious dishonesty, and will coolly assert, without attempting to adduce a particle of proof, that he does not himself believe in his own arguments. Such tactics as these have before now been employed to evade the force of Catholic objections against the Ritualistic position, and they are doubtless effective enough with those who are content to regard their favourite editor or preacher as their infallible Pope. But he addresses himself with confidence to "men of good will," who are not deterred from admitting the unbroken force of an argument as a whole, by the angry, though perhaps just, criticism of some ill-considered expression, or by the successful refutation of some unimportant detail of the reasoning ; or, again, by the triumphant announcement of the discovery of some obviously unintentional error in the relation of facts. And especially he addresses himself to those who have not yet bound themselves by perplexing engagements, and who have a growing

consciousness of a vocation to the ecclesiastical state. He will be amply repaid for any trouble the present publication may have caused or cause him if its production result in adding to the ranks of the Catholic Priesthood in England one or two who would otherwise have wasted their strength on the shifting sands of Anglicanism.

§ 3. *The Question of Orders not of Primary Importance.*

It is hardly too much to say that the assumption of the validity of Anglican Orders is in practice made to serve as the citadel whence Ritualists defend their position against all comers. It is the argument with which some even silence the timid whisperings of their own consciences, or at least with which they permit that voice to be stifled, when, in view of "Roman difficulties," they seek counsel from their Anglican Bishop or priest. "I do not ask you to see in the Church of England the ideal that a Church should be : I do not deny that Rome has advantages which we lack. But let us not too readily abandon the privileges that we certainly have. Anyhow our Orders are valid, and that is the great thing." Such language as this, the writer knows from experience, is time after time employed to retain in Anglicanism those whose foot is on the very threshold of the Church. The position is stated as if acknowledged as impregnable, and it is thought virtually to decide the matter.

And yet in truth the question of the reality of the Anglican Priesthood is not strictly a fundamental one in the controversy between "England and Rome;" although, as has been seen, it may be such practically in the case of individuals. Ritualism, indeed, collapses if its Orders are null.* An Anglican who rightly conceives of the Christian Priesthood, and of its necessary place in the Christian dispensation, cannot maintain his position if arguments are adduced proving to his own satisfaction that the Church of England has no true priests. But he would not, therefore, be bound to become a Roman Catholic. He might seek to

* See in the Appendix, Note II., on "The Order of Corporate Reunion."

unite himself with one of the Oriental Churches, or with the Dutch Jansenists, or else with the new communions in Germany and Switzerland. Or even he might turn his attention to the Irvingite sect ; for should he have (as many Ritualists have) a notion of the special mission of the English nation in the Gospel dispensation, it would not be extravagant to argue that the failure of the Apostolical Succession in the Established Church of England was but a prelude to a new outpouring of the Holy Spirit in the foundation of an English Apostolate.

Indeed, those who have for years devoted all their energies to the propagation of Ritualism as a distinct system, protesting against their own Bishops hardly less loudly than against the Pope, are, perhaps, of all men the least likely to make their submission to the Church. The peculiar spirit of their movement, a very different thing from the Catholic spirit, has penetrated into the very marrow of their bones, and has rendered them exceptionally fierce against Rome. The sight of a Catholic priest, or church, or book, irritates them and stirs up their bile. They can speak with equanimity of the modern prophets of godlessness, but not of the Pope. They can even fraternise on certain questions with the former, but they will have "no peace with Rome." Clearly such men will not become Catholics should their prejudices in favour of their Orders gradually melt away ; and, indeed, no priest who understood their temper would be willing formally to receive them into the Church without some considerable period of probation. In short, if the Anglican Priesthood be null, the professed Ritualist must, indeed, cease to claim to belong to the Church of England ; but he need approach no nearer to the Vicar of Christ ; nor, without some change of disposition, is he likely to do so.

But does the High Church position become impregnable

if Anglican Orders are proved beyond reasonable question? The answer to this question depends on the acceptance of the Catholic doctrine on the nature of the Church. If Catholic principles are accepted, the position is certainly not secure; what it may be on Anglican principles depends on what those principles are; and they are hard to ascertain. On this point a momentary digression must be allowed with reference to the special subject in hand.

All Catholics who have written on Anglican Orders complain of the difficulty they have in ascertaining the principles of those whose position they are calling in question. Catholic theologians are sometimes quoted as if they were recognised Anglican authorities; but stray sentences only are thus accepted, while all that will not fit in with the Anglican theory is treated as of no account. Martène* is regarded as infallible if he takes a strong view of the coöperation of the assistant Bishops at a consecration; but he is not to be followed if he excludes from the essential form of Episcopal or priestly ordination those words which the Church of England uses. Morinus† is a binding authority so long as he denies the necessity of the "tradition of the instruments," but he is clearly wrong in regarding as invalid, until the Church dispense, the ordinations of heretics and schismatics. This Anglican method of employing Catholic theological treatises has been compared to the use made by street-boys of gentlemen's carriages.

* Martène, one of the learned Benedictines of St. Maur, published his famous treatise, *De Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, in 1700.

† Morinus, who published his treatise *De Sacris Ordinationibus* in 1655, was a great student of antiquity, and was disposed to regard Holy Order as an element in the Church's jurisdiction,—a view which has not been condemned, though neither is it commonly accepted. And those who boast of their adherence to the principles of antiquity will not need to be reminded that it furnishes plenty of precedents and authorities for regarding as doubtful, if not as null, the ordinations of heretics and schismatics, simply on the ground of such irregularity.

They get up behind unobserved, ride as far as suits their convenience, and then jump down and jeer at the driver. But it is clear that such a liberty, to accept or reject the *dicta* of theologians, on no principle save that of turning every weapon to account, is only defensible when it is understood that the passages are quoted simply as *argumenta ad hominem*; and it might perhaps have fairly been so used in the earlier days of the controversy. But the case is now different. The modern advanced High Churchmen distinctly claim nothing less than the Catholic Priesthood. They desire in this matter to stand on precisely the same footing as Catholics, whom they no longer accuse of exaggerating the sacerdotal character of the Christian Ministry. Since then the claim is to Catholic privileges, it must be defended on Catholic principles; if for no other reason but for this, that no others exist to which appeal can be made. There is no recognised Anglican theology on ordination; and Anglicans who demur to the conclusions of Catholic theologians which they fear may tell against their claim, do so, not on principle but from private judgment; and the controversy must obviously be endless if the captious objections of every individual claimant are to be taken into consideration. It will be understood, therefore, that in the pages that follow what are commonly recognised as Catholic principles are taken for granted; and here it may be well to indicate one which has an important bearing on the controversy as a whole—viz., that where the Sacraments or salvation is concerned we are bound to follow the “safer” opinion in preference to others, which, even if allowed as “probable,” or “more probable,” are yet not reckoned “safe.” And thus, where differences exist, we must in practice be guided by what theologians generally hold, and not insist on the doctrine of any single writer, however eminent, whose view is confessedly peculiar.

To return, then, to the question above proposed,—Can a High Churchman regard his position as impregnable if it be allowed that his Orders are valid? Can he with this concession justly describe himself as “a Catholic priest?” He endeavours to do so with the aid of a theory, now apparently regarded as an axiom, though it is in fact a pure assumption, which Catholics could never allow. The theory is that Christian communities, separated from the rest of the Catholic world, but possessed of a true Episcopal Hierarchy, are *ipso facto* “Churches,” “parts of the true Church,” and retain the main privileges of Catholic communion. But the history of all schisms from the first proves conclusively that no such test of Catholicity has ever been recognised. The possession of Orders is a mark of the true Church, certainly; but who will say that it constitutes “a Church” *per se*?

Nor, again, can a just parallel be drawn between the isolated position of the Anglican Church since 1560, and any of those temporary suspensions of intercommunion which from time to time have clouded the face of Christendom. There is at least this broad distinction between the two, that in these latter cases there existed no fundamental controversy concerning faith or even concerning authority. The divisions were due to questions of fact, or to jealousies aroused by what was regarded as a too sweeping exercise of authority, which was nevertheless confessed to be in itself legitimate, and even divine.*

No Anglican, however, who has regard to the unity of the Church, would venture to claim for his own community a position less questionable than that of one of the Eastern Churches. And, even if his Orders be allowed, it is not easy to see how such a position can be maintained. For,

* See in the Appendix, Note III., on the “Indefectibility of the Church’s Unity.”

on the principles which the primitive Church would have regarded as Catholic, although ever since its separation from the Roman See the Anglican community had scrupulously preserved every detail of its ancient discipline and ritual, and had surrendered no iota of its faith,* yet no Catholic in communion with Rome could, without mortal sin, have received any Sacrament from an Anglican priest; nor could even her own children have done so with safety, if once they came to realise that their position was probably schismatical. And this danger would have been vastly increased if the separated community deflected ever so slightly from its ancient faith; for it would then have become guilty of heresy as well as of schism; and in matters of faith to offend in one point is to be guilty of all. Moreover, what is of the gravest importance, such members of this fallen Church as retained their orthodoxy could not remain in communion with those who had thus lapsed from the faith, without participating in their heresy themselves, and incurring the same condemnation. Of course no account is here made of the invincible ignorance in which the vast majority of the members of the separated body would have quietly practised their religion, knowing nothing of the questionableness of their position, and so not sinning against light. The case is taken only of those who may be supposed to have had the controversy before them, and not to have been ignorant of the maxim above referred to, that, where salvation is concerned, the safer course and no other

* The hypothesis assumes that the schism of the English Church *might* have been accomplished without the abandonment of any article of the faith. But in point of fact there was, and perhaps necessarily, heresy as well as schism in the act of 1534. For the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and the necessity of union with him, had already been defined by more than one Council by which the English Church was bound; and notably at Florence, not a hundred years before, in the famous decree to which both East and West assented. And the rejection of the Pope's authority was in England, as in all other cases, but the *point de départ* for a further abandonment of the faith.

is to be followed. On Catholic principles, then, what may be described as the ideal Anglican Church would not have been a safe resting-place for those who valued their souls. And how far below this ideal has been, and is, its actual condition !

In this connection it may be worth while to reflect that hardly one of the early heresies and schisms lacked true Bishops and priests. Moreover, they commonly differed from the Church only on points which the modern spirit would regard as trivial. Frequently, indeed, an outsider would have been barely able to distinguish between Catholic and heretic, so great would have been the similarity between the two in doctrine, discipline, and ritual, and so narrow and inconsiderable (save from the Catholic point of view) the divergence.* And yet how uncompromising was always the attitude of the Church ; how severe her denunciations of all Sacraments and worship administered, received, or offered outside her pale. Catholics said, and said truly, that those who deliberately took part in heretical or schismatical worship thereby forfeited salvation.† Yet this worship was offered by men who, on principles commonly accepted by Catholics, and insisted upon by Anglicans, were true Bishops and priests. Mass was said by them with all the ceremonies that the Catholics used ; absolution and communion were given ; confirmation, Holy Orders, and unction were administered ; and for the most part no one could question the validity of the

* On this subject see "Development of Christian Doctrine," pp. 248-273.

† The well-known words of St. Augustine with reference to the schismatical Bishop of Cæsarea, may be quoted in illustration :—"Extra Ecclesiam Catholicam totum potest præter salutem. Potest habere honorem, potest habere Sacramentum, potest cantare Alleluia, potest respondere Amen, potest Evangelium tenere, potest in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti fidem et habere et prædicare ; sed nusquam nisi in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ salutem poterit invenire."

rites, though they might, and did, strongly denounce their unlawfulness. And yet, with strange inconsistency, Anglicans hold that the Catholics of those days (that is, the Christians who were in communion with the See of Rome) were right in thus acting; while they complain of unfair treatment if modern Catholics assert that no one can secure salvation by partaking of Anglican Sacraments, which until a few years ago were not even regarded by their administrators as channels of supernatural grace, but only as external signs of God's favour and goodness.*

What, then, does the High Churchman gain if he succeeds in establishing the validity of his Orders? If he accept, as the advanced school now commonly do, the definitions of the Council of Trent, he cannot defend the schism of the Church of England in the sixteenth century; and he must further allow that since that event she has insisted on her ministers teaching certain grave heresies, while she has tolerated others even worse.† Not content with blaspheming the Mass, she has cast it out, both name and thing, and has opened the door to utter profanation of the Eucharistic Presence, had she indeed possessed it. True it is that latterly a small percentage of her clergy, consistently with their assumed position, but inconsistently with the history of their Church, the language of their Prayer-book, and the known wishes of their Bishops, have proceeded to pay honour to their Sacrament in a way that Catholics can hardly surpass; and it may be hoped

* Baptism, however, must be excluded from this category, for, not depending on Holy Orders, it is in all cases (unless the adult recipient interpose an *obex*), when administered with the right matter, form, and intention, Catholic baptism, and remits sin, infuses grace into the soul, and admits the baptised into the Catholic Church. Thus "the Church of one's baptism" is always the Catholic Church, even though one lapse from it by being brought up a Protestant; and to be reconciled to her is simply to recognise and to return to the Mother who first gave us supernatural life.

† See in the Appendix, Note IV., on "The Anglican Church and Heresy."

that this worship, though woefully misdirected, is mercifully accepted when it is offered in all sincerity. But the present cannot undo the past; and the few hundred Ritualistic churches, in not more than a dozen of which is the new mode of worship five-and-twenty years old, barely do more than bring out into stronger relief the Protestantism of all the rest, and indeed of all until our own day.

When, therefore, a High Churchman is satisfied that his Orders are valid, instead of rejoicing as if the victory was won, he should rather sorrowfully confess that his Church has proved itself utterly unworthy of the Divine Presence, and of the gifts of sacramental grace which he believes his Priesthood empowers him to dispense.

The question, then, may fairly be asked, "To what purpose do you maintain the validity of your Orders, when, even if that be allowed, you cannot prove that you are within the Church?" The possession of Orders, essential though it be, does not constitute "a Church." It is a step in the right direction, certainly, but not the most important step. And an Anglican can do nothing to establish the legitimacy of his position within the Church of England until he is clear as to what "the Church" really is, and can obtain the acceptance of certain definite principles which will make "the Church" include his own communion. The difficulty, in short, lies in the absence of any satisfactory definition of that divine Society which will place him within it, but leave ordinary Protestants outside.

It may, perhaps, be admitted that "the Church," being *sui generis*, is incapable of exact definition. Nevertheless it can be described, and that from more than one point of view, with such accuracy as to make clear its characteristic features, which are called its notes or marks, and are commonly given as four—One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic.

Many others, not unimportant, might also be adduced ; but these have the warrant of antiquity and universal consent, and are really sufficient to identify that which they describe. Unity comes first, and on this is based the definition of the Church given in the English Catholic Catechism,—“The union of all the faithful under one Head.” And, as the Catechism goes on to explain, this Head over all has a visible representative on earth, and so the unity of the Church Militant is secured.

This principle of unity, as an essential characteristic of the Church, has always remained unquestioned among Catholics. They could not conceive the Church as existing except as One. She must be one, as the faith is one, and God is One. And so her unity is often taken for granted, and left unexpressed, in other quasi-definitions or descriptions of the Church from another point of view, commonly employed by the Fathers. They speak of her as *cætus fidelium*, “the congregation of the faithful,” “the people of God,” “the assembly of the just,” &c. And from these expressions the framers both of the Augsburg Confession and of the Thirty-nine Articles borrowed their definition of the visible Church, which thus from its origin obtains a certain respectability. But at the time that it was thus employed it was wholly inadequate to meet the controversies of the day. The unity of the Church could no longer be assumed by men whose proceedings were wholly inconsistent with faith in that unity as an essential mark of the mystical Body of Christ. The Reformers, however, by treating the Communion of Rome as no longer a portion of the Church at all, avoided the dilemma, into which otherwise they would have been driven, of having to confess that either the unity of the Church was broken, or else that they themselves were not included within it. Indeed, their whole doctrine concerning the nature of the Church had little or

nothing in common with Catholic principles, although they did not hesitate to use Catholic language that would bear their own sense. Whether the visible Church had or ought to have any visible unity at all ; whether that unity should consist in ministerial succession, or in intercommunion ; or whether it was altogether spiritual and invisible,—these were burning questions which the eighth Article of the Augsburg Confession, and the nineteenth Anglican Article following it, studiously ignored. And the result was that the definition of the Church was left, no doubt purposely, so vague that it may include all the more orthodox forms of foreign Protestantism to which the heretical movement of the sixteenth century gave rise.

The modern High Churchman is fully alive to the inadequacy of this definition when placed alongside of his own theory of the Church, and he has no scruple in rejecting it. He needs a principle which may appear to unite his own and the Eastern Churches with Rome, while it shuts out the Dissenters and the Reformed Churches of the Continent. And he thinks he finds this principle in the fourth mark of the Church,—“Apostolic,” which he takes to mean “possessing a true Episcopal succession.” It means of course this, but it means a good deal more. Besides the Apostolical Succession of Orders, it includes a similar succession of doctrine, and also of mission, as something distinct from and in addition to Orders, and necessary for their legitimate exercise. A Church is not Apostolic simply by the possession of a true Episcopate ; and the High Church clergyman who styles himself “a Catholic priest” because he is satisfied that his Orders are valid, is reasoning somewhat too rapidly, and is ignoring certain principles concerning the nature of the Church which have more claim to be styled Catholic than his own : and these principles, though they might leave him a priest, would

utterly condemn his claim to that position which he too lightly assumes to be his.

Clearly, then, the question of the validity of Anglican Orders is not of primary importance in view of the claims of the Holy Roman Church. Yet practically its importance is great, for so long as a High Church clergyman is persuaded that he is a priest, this persuasion is, from his own point of view, a really serious hindrance in the way of his submitting to Rome. In taking that step he would not indeed be called upon formally to repudiate his Orders, but he would certainly have to ignore them; and this would seem to him like neglecting the gift that is in him or even despising the grace of God. Yet on Catholic principles, which he is assumed to accept, it is not necessary, in order that this hindrance may be removed, that the nullity of the Anglican Priesthood should be proved to demonstration. From the nature of the case such a proof is impossible. It is enough that he should see that his Orders are open to grave suspicion, or that, anyhow, their exercise is unlawful; for then to cease to act as a priest becomes his duty under pain of sin. And the responsibility of ignoring them is assumed by the Church; so that if otherwise convinced of the justice of her claims upon him, he need not let the chance that he is already a priest deter him from seeking reconciliation with her, or even from offering himself eventually for her ordination. No doubt, if his prejudice in favour of Anglican Orders should obstinately cling to him after he has been received into the Church, it might embarrass him in his choice of occupation as a Catholic. But it would be strange if some experience of the great reality that Sacred Orders are within the Church, as contrasted with the uncertain character of their nominal counterpart outside, did not convince him that in relation to the Catholic Priesthood he is but a layman, and,

as such, free to adopt any legitimate secular profession ; or to offer himself without scruple for genuine ordination, should he be found to have a vocation to the ecclesiastical state.* And as a true Catholic priest he will no longer have occasion to prove the validity of his Orders, any more than a man in good health would seek to assure himself that he was alive by testing the circulation of his blood.

* See in the Appendix, Note V., on "Conditional Ordination."

§ 4. *Scope of the Proposed Discussion.*

These introductory remarks, which have already been extended to too great a length, would not, however, be complete without a few words of explanation as to the motives which have induced the writer to undertake the discussion at all, when it may be fairly urged that the learned treatise of Canon Estcourt, published some six years ago, ought to be regarded as virtually closing the controversy on the Catholic side.* The value of his work has been justly estimated in the first of two articles on Anglican Orders, which appeared in the *American Catholic World* in July and August, 1874:—"Canon Estcourt's book is in all respects a most remarkable one, and can hardly fail to make an era in the controversy. It is a monument, not merely of successful research, but of that intimate acquaintance with a very complicated and difficult subject which nothing but the assiduous labour of years can give. It is perfectly calm and judicial in its tone and in its conclusions; for learning, like charity, is long-suffering. It does not contain, we believe all parties will admit, a single instance of over-strained or *ad captandum* argument, whilst moving with measured pace to its unassailable conclusions. So studiously gentle has Canon Estcourt been throughout in his language, and so scrupulous in his choice of weapons, that we can hardly wonder if some of his Catholic readers are startled, as though the trumpet had given an uncertain sound: and if Anglicans, like the executioner's victim in the story, hardly know at first that the fatal blow has been struck."†

* "The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed," by E. E. Estcourt, M.A., F.S.A., Canon of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. London: 1873.

† *Catholic World*, vol. xix. p. 467. New York: 1874. Compare the testimony of the Rev. George Porter, S.J., in a review of the same treatise in

To this tribute of praise the present writer heartily subscribes ; and he is all the more bound to do so, since throughout this Essay (which does not so much profess to bring new facts to bear on the controversy as to be a review of the whole from the Catholic standpoint) he has made free use of the work in question.

At the same time it is undeniable that the treatise, able and convincing as it is, has not produced among those for whose benefit chiefly it was written, the effect that might fairly have been expected. Indeed, there are Anglican clergymen who assert that since Canon Estcourt's book came out, they have had no doubt about their Orders. Such a phenomenon seems to be only explicable as follows. Speaking generally, Anglicans will not read, much less will they study, Catholic books, which they fear may contain conclusions disagreeable to themselves. It is partly fear and partly prejudice that withholds those who have the leisure to read ; while the great mass of the Ritualistic clergy are so immersed in self-imposed work, that they have barely any time to study or think, and can only pick up theology from the columns of the *Church Times*.

Now, Canon Estcourt's book is one which cannot even be understood except by those who have had some theological training ; and it then requires to be read with deliberation, and with a patient suspense of the judgment until the conclusion is reached, and the threads of his elaborate argument are united. Under these circumstances

the *Month* for May-June, 1873:—"Canon Estcourt is entitled to the praise of a knight *sans peur et sans reproche* in this war of Anglican ordinations. He takes his side manfully ; there is no possibility of doubting what are his convictions ; he aims his blow wherever he sees a flaw in the armour of his adversary. But he writes without bitterness ; he understands his subject thoroughly ; he knows the merits of his side, and the value of his arguments ; but he does not claim for his conclusions a greater certainty than his arguments warrant."

the small result it has as yet produced is not to be wondered at. Perhaps it will prove more effective in the future. As things are, if it falls into the hands of some High Church clergyman, he does not attempt to read it or to master its reasoning. He dips into it here and there, and with triumphant levity exclaims, "He gives up the Nag's Head fable; he says the delivery of the sacred vessels is not essential; that 'Receive the Holy Ghost' with prayer and the imposition of hands suffices; and that no more than a general intention of doing what the Church does is required. What more do we need? He withdraws all the charges that used to be brought against us, and so practically leaves us victorious. True, I see that at the end of his book he speaks as if he had proved our Orders invalid; but that is because, as a Roman Catholic, he feels bound to be loyal to the traditions of his sect. Unfortunately for those traditions he has been too honest to re-assert accusations which he had discovered to be groundless, and we may be thankful for his book."

It is within the writer's knowledge that such language as this has been used by Anglicans of Canon Estcourt's treatise. Evidently the speaker had not really read what he nevertheless treated with such familiarity. Whether the pages of this Essay will fare better at the same hands it is impossible to foretell; but the fact that the solid book cannot obtain a serious hearing suggests that the lighter and less learned work may have a chance.

Moreover, Canon Estcourt has strictly confined himself to the historical and theological aspects of the question, and has not taken into consideration what may be described as the moral evidence against the reality of the Anglican Priesthood. Nor is the writer aware that this important view of the subject has ever been stated in detail on the Catholic side, though it has been suggested in a well-known

sentence,—“ Antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts.”* It is this “urgency” that practically forbids Catholics, and especially those born and bred within the Church, to regard the modern claim as anything but a vain pretension. A sort of instinct tells them that a “parson” cannot possibly be a priest; and even to discuss the validity of his Orders seems to many to be a condescension that can only mislead. But, notwithstanding the cogency of this moral evidence, the writer believes that some details of it will be found stated for the first time, from the Catholic standpoint, in the pages of this Essay; and since in this field alone can he claim any kind of originality, he has given this *primâ facie* evidence precedence before the historical and theological considerations.

The question of Anglican ordinations is neither purely historical, nor purely theological, nor purely moral. The evidence adducible may be roughly divided into these three classes, but it is difficult to keep them distinct, as they overlap each other; and the same facts viewed from these three different points may furnish distinct but corroborative testimony, which thus has a cumulative character, and renders the conclusion inevitable.

With regard to the moral evidence against the modern High Church claim, the writer ventures to doubt whether more than a very few, if indeed any at all, of the Anglican clergy, who assert that they are “Catholic priests,” have given it a fair consideration. They have been content to see moral evidence in their favour in the present success of their work, and they have not cared to look further. “Visible facts,” whether occurring in our own day, or recorded in history, interpret with no uncertain voice, and in a sense unfavourable to their claim, the more complicated side of the controversy.

* “Apologia pro vitâ suâ,” p. 341.

That the controversy, historically and theologically considered, is unquestionably complicated, and must not therefore be hastily judged, will be made clear by the following summary of the various points at issue, most of which are noticed, either at length or in passing, in the third part of this Essay, or in the Appendix. As to the history it is asked :—

1. Was Parker, the *caput et principium* of the Elizabethan Hierarchy, ever really consecrated ?

2. Was Barlow, Parker's alleged Consecrator, ever a Bishop himself ?

3. What ecclesiastical *status* has the Anglican Ministry claimed (*a*) in the reign of Elizabeth, (*b*) in the seventeenth century, and (*c*) in our own day ?

4. How did the Catholic Church (*a*) in the reign of Mary treat Orders received with the Edwardine rites ; and (*b*) what has she ever allowed with regard to Anglican claims advanced since Elizabeth's accession ?

And then, as to the theology, it is asked :—

1. What is the Sacrament of Holy Order ?

2. What is the nature of the Christian Priesthood which it confers ?

3. What "form" is necessary that it may be conferred validly ?

4. What "matter" is necessary ?

5. What amount of right "intention" is necessary ?

6. What if either form or matter, *in se* sufficient, be deliberately, of set heretical intention, substituted for what the Church has hitherto used ? and what if both matter and form are thus altered ?

7. How do the Anglican ordination rites used from 1552 to 1662 stand these tests ? and how the Anglican Bishops who used them ?

8. To what extent do the assistant Bishops coöperate in a consecration ?

9. Is it certain that all Anglican ordinands were baptised?

10. Whence do the Anglican clergy obtain mission and jurisdiction to exercise their Priesthood, supposing their Orders are valid?

Perhaps a word of personal explanation is needed before the discussion is fairly entered upon. It may be objected against the writer that some seven or eight years ago he defended, and that publicly, the position which he now treats as indefensible; and that he acted the part which he now condemns. The accusation, however humiliating, is just. And yet in reply he may be permitted to urge that his error was due to his having followed, perhaps too readily, the opinions of older men, of whose ability and goodness he could have no doubt, and who were certainly in a position to have mastered the question, as he assumed they had; and it is on this last point that he now thinks he must have been mistaken. He was himself at the time very ignorant of the extent of the controversy. He thought that Parker's consecration was alone seriously objected to historically. And, as to the theological questions, he had a vague impression that the Papists had first attacked with "matter," then with "form," and finally with "intention," but had each time been compelled to retire in confusion, refuted out of the mouths of their own theologians. He thus became convinced that Anglican Orders at least were beyond dispute; and this conviction even furnished him with a further argument against Rome; for Catholics must surely be unreasonable, not to say dishonest, people, if they persist in an opinion which they know to be wrong. Anglican Orders then being valid, the Anglican clergyman is a priest, a Catholic priest (for what else could he be?), and

has to say Mass and absolve. A rough kind of logic led him to accept these conclusions, though at times he could not avoid the reflection that it was, to say the least, a little odd that the proper work of an Anglican priest should not have been discovered before, seeing that Mass and Penance were not new things, but had existed long before there were Anglican Orders to prove. At a later time he had leisure to examine the question, and did pay some attention to one side of it. And, without coming to any very definite conclusion, he thought he saw as much as this,—that either the Anglican succession must be defended as “Apostolical” on the ground that the Roman Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of the Christian Ministry was “too sacerdotal” and erroneous, and that at the Reformation its exaggerated pretensions were justly laid aside (the historical succession of persons he did not inquire into); or else that, if the Roman Catholic doctrine be the truth, as Ritualists hold it is, then the Church of England had not retained the Priesthood ordained by Christ. For a time the former of these alternatives commended itself to him. It does not exclude the idea that the Anglican Ministry may be possessed of a quasi-sacerdotal character; and so it retains some notion of priestly dignity, without necessarily involving “extremes” either in doctrine or practice. It is, in fact, the view commonly held by moderate High Churchmen; and the writer’s position naturally made it acceptable to him. But eventually he saw that it was a mere product of private judgment, without any substantial existence; and, through the mercy of God, the second alternative gradually fixed itself in his mind, and formed one of the motives to which his submission to the Church was due.

With thus much of personal explanation the writer commends his book to the patient judgment of the reader,

begging him to take note rather of what is said than of who has said it. A further and more serious admonition he is glad to be able to express in borrowed words :—

“Put not from you what you have here found ; regard it not as mere matter of present controversy ; set not out resolved to refute it, and looking about for the best way of doing so ; seduce not yourself with the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past ; nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so ; nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long.”*

* “Development of Christian Doctrine,” p. 443.

II.

PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.

§ 5. *Limitation of the Discussion to the Extreme High Church Claim.*

CATHOLIC writers, who have disputed the validity of Anglican Orders, have had occasion to complain of the difficulty they have found in ascertaining the exact nature of the claim which they contest. A vague assertion of an "Apostolical Succession," with nothing to show that the terms "Bishop" and "Priest" are used in the Catholic sense, can only be met, if it is worth meeting at all, by questioning the actual historical succession; and then the admission that the succession cannot be certainly disproved may seem to allow even more than is claimed. Thus Canon Estcourt says, "It is difficult to learn what Anglican writers mean by the terms they use. They use Catholic phrases and Catholic arguments; but when their words come to be examined, it is doubtful whether they use them in a Catholic sense. Sometimes they distinctly repudiate the doctrines which Catholics believe to be involved in the terms employed."*

So far as the present writer is concerned, this difficulty no longer exists. The claim that he proposes to question is asserted with the utmost clearness. It is not merely that the latest writers of note on the Anglican side expressly state that by the Apostolical Succession they mean what Catholics mean, the transmission of a super-

* "Anglican Ordinations," p. 169.

natural gift, the sacramental grace of Order ; but that in practice the modern Ritualist distinctly affirms that his Church possesses the Catholic Priesthood ; and with nothing short of this will he be content. What that Priesthood is will be only incidentally noticed in the pages of this Essay, since the controversy before us does not concern its nature, but only the question of its being in the possession of the Anglican Church. It is enough now to say that the Ritualist asserts that, equally with the Roman Catholic priest, he is divinely empowered to offer Sacrifice and to absolve from sin. And he admits that there exists in the world no other legitimate Priesthood save the Catholic ; so that if he has not this he has none. He is either *sacerdos* or a layman, for there is no middle place. Not that he would deny, what Catholics also admit, that the word "layman" and its correlatives may be used in contrast with other things besides the Christian Priesthood. Thus, ministers of all denominations may, with reference to their own communities, and as a matter of courtesy, be addressed as "Reverend ;" just as Catholics give to the Anglican Hierarchy their legal titles, without thereby admitting their ecclesiastical character. But the Ritualistic priest is content with no such half measures. He will not tolerate that he should be called a priest merely with reference to his own Church, and yet be regarded as a layman in relation to the Catholic Priesthood. He maintains that his Priesthood is in all respects the same as the Catholic ; that his Anglican ordination has conferred on him an indelible character. He claims that he can do all that the Catholic priest does ; and indeed he can do more, for (apart from self-imposed restrictions) he can "celebrate" when and where he will, and can also, without troubling any Bishop for leave, absolve all persons indiscriminately in any quarter of the globe.

It is then this extreme, not to say extravagant, claim that this Essay is designed to meet ; and, to make clear the limits within which the discussion is intended to be confined, a few words shall indicate those whose position will not here be attacked.

A religious community, originating in heresy and schism, may in course of time forget its own origin and quietly lay aside its anti-Catholic spirit. The children it begets in these its later years, although material heretics, are not formally such, unless they see the Catholic Church and reject her ; and they may be wholly free from the heretical spirit. The truth is imperfectly known by them, but, so far as it is known, it is accepted with simplicity, obedience, and unquestioning love. Such men, though not of the Church's body, belong to her soul ; they are Catholics in spirit, though not in fact. And such were, and still are, many, perhaps the great majority of the members of the Established Church of England.*

Who cannot recall some bright example of the "clergyman of the old school," who made no pretence to be a priest, but who discharged with diligence all the pastoral duties he believed had been entrusted to him ? He knew little, it may be, of theology, and little of the Catholic idea of heroic sanctity. But he conformed with child-like obedience to the system he had inherited, and would have thought it presumptuous to attempt or even to wish

* So St. Augustine (Ep. 162) :—"Hi qui sententiam suam, quamvis falsam atque perversam, nullâ pertinaci animositate defendunt, præsertim quam non audaciâ præsumptionis suæ pepererunt, sed a seductis atque in errorem lapsis parentibus acceperunt, quærunt autem cautâ sollicitudine veritatem, parati corrigi cùm invenerint, nequaquam sunt inter hæreticos deputandi." And in another place he says, *Multæ oves foris, multi lupi intus*, with reference to our Lord's words, "Alias oves habeo, quæ non sunt ex hoc ovili ; et illas oportet me adducere, et vocem meam audient, et fiet unum ovile et unus pastor." It is perhaps necessary to add that St. Augustine was a Roman Catholic Bishop, and that his words *foris* and *intus* are used exclusively in relation to the Communion of the Successor of St. Peter.

to alter it. Controversy, or whatever showed that men were not of one mind, was painful to him. He was only anxious to fulfil his duties faithfully, and he judged no one severely but himself. To have been told he was bound to offer Sacrifice, and to confess his flock, would only have puzzled and distressed him. He never dreamed that his Orders had conferred upon him supernatural powers. They were simply his solemn commission to read prayers and to preach, to baptize, and to administer the Lord's Supper some six or eight times in the year. And he held that in being ordained he had bound himself by a vow. Yet he did not imagine that this charge came to him necessarily through an unbroken succession of Catholic and Protestant Bishops. It was the law of the land and the law of his Church that he should thus become qualified for his post, and that was enough for him.

Who would care to deny that his Orders were valid for all that he claimed for them? In Catholic eyes he was a layman, no doubt; and for the most part his life, both private and social, was not unlike that of a Catholic layman. His claim to a clerical character had relation only to his own Church and country; what they bid him do, that the Orders they gave him empowered him to do; and he had no wish to be thought a Catholic priest.

The men of the generation of which we speak have passed or are passing away. They were, it may well be maintained, the best fruit that the Church of England has borne. Perhaps they were unconsciously not in harmony with every letter of the Prayer-book and Articles; but who ever has been, or could be? Perhaps, moreover, the religion they taught was uncertain in its doctrine, and without deep influence over the lives of the people. Certainly it could ill have withstood the onslaught of modern scepticism, or have stemmed the rising tide of

immorality. And they are happy in not living on into this last quarter of the nineteenth century, which would only have pained and bewildered them with its roar of controversy prevailing everywhere, save within the Catholic Church.

What then these good men claimed for their Orders will not here be called in question. A theological treatise on the nature of the Church and of the Catholic Priesthood would be the way to meet their claim, were there any need to do so. And the same applies to any vindication of their Orders, whatever they may conceive them to be, that might be put forth by modern Broad Churchmen. Nor even is it clear that we are necessarily concerned with the vague assertion, commonly made by moderate High Churchmen, that the Church of England has retained the Apostolical Succession. They do not suppose it involves the retention of a sacrificing Priesthood. To them it is barely more than a matter of decency or fitness that the Reformed Episcopate should be able to trace its descent from primitive times. They do not fret themselves about alleged insufficiency in the matter and form provided in the Anglican Ordinal. They are satisfied that the *jus divinum* of their Hierarchy can be maintained if it is shown by documentary evidence that a continuous succession of persons styled Bishops connects the existing Anglican Episcopate with the ancient Church; and that certain solemn ceremonies, especially the imposition of hands, have been used to continue that succession.*

* It may be worth while here to note that the term "Episcopal" is not by itself sufficiently definite to characterise those communities which, though certainly not on Catholic principles forming "parts of the Church," are yet admitted to have retained the Catholic Priesthood. The term "sacerdotal" would be more accurate. For Episcopacy *per se* has to do with oversight and government, and need not, so far as its terms go, involve a sacerdotal Ministry. There may be a nominal Episcopate without a Priesthood; but a true

So modest a claim as this differs widely from that advanced by the Ritualists ; though, on the other hand, if it is worth anything at all, Ritualism is its logical outcome. But, as things are, its aim is chiefly to assert the dignity of the Episcopate, and it has little in common with the Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Order. It therefore falls outside the range of the present undertaking ; it concerns Protestant Dissenters rather than Catholics. It is maintained with the view of distinguishing Anglicanism from other forms of Protestantism. It does not venture to assert that the Anglican priest is ordained to offer Sacrifice, and by rights, when "abroad," should be permitted to say Mass at Catholic altars.

While then we might admit that, relatively to its own community, the Anglican Ministry may be all that moderate High Churchmen maintain, we should have to contend that, unless it be also something more, it is, in relation to the Catholic Priesthood, nothing at all ; for the Church acknowledges the existence of no such *semi-sacerdotium*. But, until the arguments of the Ritualists have convinced Low and Broad Churchmen that the Catholic doctrine concerning the Christian Ministry is the truth, and have persuaded the less advanced among High Churchmen that their Apostolical Succession constitutes them priests in the full Catholic sense of the term, they will not be affected by the considerations urged in this Essay.

We have now narrowed the field in which the question before us lies. With fully nine-tenths of the Anglican clergy we have here no controversy at all. We are not

Priesthood necessarily implies the existence of a real Episcopate. There are Methodist "Bishops" in America ; and "Archbishops" as well as "Bishops" in the Scandinavian Churches. Yet Ritualists agree with Catholics in regarding them all as mere laymen. The pertinence of this distinction will be seen later.

called upon to disprove what they do not themselves assert. Widely as we differ from them, they do not cross our path. Those with whom we are concerned, are those who are nearest to us in theological opinion and sympathy, though unhappily at times they seem to be in temper the furthest removed of all. And our controversy is not about the truth of what the Church teaches on the Sacrament of Holy Order, for that they fully admit. It is simply a question of facts. Have Anglicans that Priesthood which Roman Catholics and the Oriental Churches, generally speaking, have? Do the Orders they receive confer on them sacramental grace, endowing them with supernatural powers, and enabling them to consecrate the Body of Christ, and to absolve penitent sinners in his name? Ritualists to these questions answer decisively, Yes; Catholics, with equal persuasion, say, No. Either this or that answer is wrong. We think we shall be able to show that the latter is right beyond all reasonable doubt.

§ 6. *The Distinctive Marks of Sacerdotal and of Non-Sacerdotal "Churches."*

It has already been allowed that the Christian Priesthood may be in the possession of communities separated from the unity of the Church. We need not stop to inquire which of its powers may be exercised validly, although unlawfully, apart from that unity, and which such separation would probably invalidate. We may allow, for the sake of argument, that special circumstances make good what might otherwise frustrate what is done, and that therefore all Sacraments administered and received within these communities are good and true.

We have now in view such sacerdotal communities as the Eastern Churches which are not in communion with Rome, and the Jansenists of Holland;* and we proceed to notice various characteristics which distinguish them from other religious bodies confessedly unsacerdotal, such as the continental Protestants, and the English and American Dissenters. And if it can be shown that these

* The so-called "Old-Catholics" are not here taken into consideration; for though they appear to have two or three Bishops validly, however unlawfully, consecrated, the community (if it be still one), is too young to have as yet special and definite characteristics. And there are already signs that, in Switzerland at least, it will not long care to continue the succession. Give them a hundred years, and their children will either have returned to the Church, or have wandered very far from her.

As to the Dutch Jansenists, though historically interesting, their sect is numerically insignificant when compared with the Catholics of Holland, who now form rather more than a third of the population. They are, moreover, divided into two parties, the hostility between which has been considerably augmented by the consecration of Dr. Reinkens, an utterly irregular act, even from their own point of view; and the total dissolution of the sect is only a question of time. There are five times as many Catholics in the town of Birmingham as there are Jansenists in all Holland; and no one now makes any account of them save Ritualists, who will grasp at any straw with which they may beat the Pope.

characteristics are found where the Priesthood is found, and are absent where it is absent, it will be fair to conclude that there is some intimate connection between the two, and that, *primâ facie*, these marks may be regarded as evidence, *sine quâ non*, of the existence of valid Orders. Certain it is that (as all will confess) within the Church Catholic and Roman the marks about to be specified are found most fully developed. Yet, as the stunted tree shows signs that under other conditions it might have been as noble as the forest-king, so the dwarfed characteristics of these separate communities testify unmistakeably to their affinity with the Roman Church, as also to her alone being in full possession of life and health and strength.

What, then, are these marks to which reference is made? First the principle of the visible unity of the Church is distinctly recognised, and the isolated position of the separated community is continually protested against as a wrong state of things. Moreover, it is not denied that this unity is somehow connected with the Roman See. An unwilling tribute is paid to some vague pre-eminence which is confessed to belong by rights to the successor of St. Peter. He is accused, certainly, of ambition and tyranny; but in the very accusation is contained some recognition of his office; nor is it asserted that Christendom can ever become one without communion with him, and an acknowledgment that he is Primate of the whole Church on earth.

And, beyond this testimony to an ideal visible unity of the Church, the separated sacerdotal community has internal unity, not merely in theory, but to a great extent in fact; for it has an uniform ritual, discipline and faith, which bind together into one body Bishops, clergy and laity. The principle of authority is in force; the layman

submits to his priest, and the priest to his Bishop, in questions which concern doctrine or ecclesiastical discipline. Traditions are jealously guarded ; and changes, however insignificant, are suspected and feared.

Looking now to the details more closely, we observe that there is a constant belief in the supernatural powers of the Priesthood, in the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and generally, in all that concerns the Sacraments and sacramental rites. The idea of mystery enters largely into its worship and religious life, and is protected by an elaborate and symbolical ritual, of which the use of lights, vestments, and incense, forms an indispensable part. Confession and works of penance are the groundwork of its discipline ; celibacy is recognised as the higher state of life ; and the counsels of perfection are at least admitted as an ideal. There is belief in the intercession of the Saints, and devotion to the holy Mother of God ; some kind of Purgatory is allowed, and prayers and Masses are said for the souls therein detained ; and all these beliefs and practices, be it remembered, are not merely those of individuals, nor of certain periods, but of the community as a whole, immemorial, universal, and necessary.

If we proceed next to examine the characteristics of the non-sacerdotal communities, we shall find that the contrary of what has been said above almost exactly describes them, except so far as a subjective pietism and deep reverence for the letter of Scripture take the place of an adherence to a traditional faith, and so produce a conservative spirit similar to that found in the sects which have the Priesthood. But the effect of these substitutes is not permanent ; in the long-run they do not exclude that tendency to an ever-widening Liberalism, which may be regarded as the distinctive characteristic of all Pro-

testant communities. Submission to living authority is not an universally recognised principle, and, in matters of faith, is entirely repudiated. The pew sits in judgment on the pulpit, and the minister weighs in the balance, and finds wanting, the doctrine and practice of his ecclesiastical superiors. Thus, in course of time, the individual spirit destroys all possibility of corporate unity or action.* There is, moreover, a readiness to let go first one doctrine, and then another, so that the faith common to all the members steadily diminishes, and becomes less and less definite. If the creed of the isolated sacerdotal communities is in danger of becoming encrusted with superstition, that of these others is continually yielding to the attacks of Rationalism, and may in time vanish altogether.

* See in the Appendix, Note VI., on "Anglicanism and Corporate Reunion."

§ 7. *Application of the preceding Criterion to the Case of the Church of England.*

Now this division, though at first sight a little arbitrary, is really exhaustive of all the divisions of Christendom, and in the one or the other category the Church of England must be placed. All sects or "Churches" not in communion with the See of Peter either have the Priesthood, or they have not. The Priesthood is of divine institution, whereas all other Ministries are of human devising; they differ from it, therefore, not merely in degree, but in kind. And so, though various causes may combine to give greater external dignity and importance to this or that Ministry, which is, in fact, of human and not of divine appointment, such accidental circumstances cannot avail to place it on the same platform as the Priesthood ordained by Christ.

Three Christian communities seem to present some difficulty in being thus definitely classified as sacerdotal or not. These are the Lutheran Church of Norway and Sweden, the "Catholic and Apostolic Church" generally associated with the name of the late Mr. Irving, and the Church of England.* The first two need not detain us long, since those with whom we are now concerned generally accept the Catholic estimate of them. Yet, *primâ facie*, a good deal might be said for the Orders of both, if names, externals, and pretensions were to be our only guide. The Scandinavian Lutherans have Archbishops and Bishops, and the succession is continued by formal ordination with imposition of hands. Several important details of Catholic ritual they have never abandoned—notably, the use of lights

* The Moravian community might perhaps be added to this list, as it prefers a claim to an Apostolical Succession, which some Anglicans admit.

and vestments in the Eucharistic service. Moreover, the doctrines of the Real Presence and of the Apostolical Succession have been continuously held in this "Church," which is described as "the most conservative of Protestant sects." Nevertheless, Dr. Littledale asserts that historical evidence disproves to his satisfaction the claim which the Swedish Church prefers, that she is served by a validly-ordained Ministry. And indeed, apart from the flaw in the succession which he alleges, he expresses himself as satisfied that the claim is unfounded, simply on the ground that not long ago the Swedish pastor in London entrusted his duties for some time to a pastor from Denmark, in which country it appears that the Bishops have certainly lost the succession.* Accepting, then, this verdict as a just one (and Catholics have no doubt on the subject), we learn at least as much as this from the case of the Scandinavian Church, that professions and appearances must not be our only guide.

The Irvingite sect teaches the same lesson. If we looked to its doctrine, discipline and ritual, without regard to its origin and history, we should certainly be deceived as to its character. What that is need not here be discussed, for Anglicans agree with Catholics in regarding the "Catholic and Apostolic Church," in spite of its brave assertions and externals, as but an insignificant Protestant sect, recent in its origin, and yet hastening to its dissolution, the outcome of an honest though mis-

* "The Two Religions," a lecture at Oxford, by R. F. Littledale, D.C.L., p. 8. On the other hand, a Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America decided that "no reason exists to think the Swedish succession lost;" and, in consequence of this declaration, the Bishop of Illinois, during a visit to Sweden, took part in what were described as "formal acts of inter-communion" with the Swedish Church. Moreover, the late Dr. Gray, of Capetown, formally notified to the Archbishop of Upsala his excommunication of Dr. Colenso; thus recognising the legitimacy of his position.

taken enthusiasm, and possessed neither of valid Orders, nor of any other element of permanence and stability.

When, then, we turn to the case of the Church of England with the view of ascertaining whether it be a sacerdotal or a non-sacerdotal community, and apply the test of those marks with which the preceding section has furnished us, we must bear in mind the lesson we have learned from Irvingism and Swedish Lutheranism, and not too hastily draw our conclusion. If the judgment formed on the *primâ facie* evidence is to be worth anything at all, that evidence must be taken as a whole, and too great stress must not be laid on this or that detail, which, on examination, may prove to be a mere anomaly, wholly insufficient to prevent the opposite conclusion being drawn.

Now the Church of England, though she certainly does not manifest unmistakeably those marks which characterise the sacerdotal sects, has at least retained the names of Bishop, and (what is more important) of priest. She has been accustomed to use a dignified ritual and liturgical order in her worship. She has been for the most part conservative and traditional in her teaching ; though she was not so in the sixteenth century, and is daily becoming less so now. Meanwhile many of her members are recovering and insisting on Catholic doctrines and practices, which seemed to have been abandoned for ever. Have we here before us a sacerdotal or a non-sacerdotal "Church?"

With a view to answering this question we must contemplate the Anglican Church *ab extrâ*, and consider what it actually has been and is. We must take no ideal view of it ; we must not be content to make Anglicanism mean what High Churchmen think it was intended to be, ought to have been, or anticipate what under their guidance it will become. We must speak of it as it actually has existed

in history, before it began to break up and to drift in opposite directions, towards Rationalism or towards the Catholic Church. In no other way can a just estimate of it be formed. No more than a one-sided account can be gained, if we question those within it who belong to one or other of its conflicting parties. The Ritualist will say the Church of England is in all respects the same as the Roman Catholic Church, adherence to the Papacy alone excepted ; the Low Churchman will say it is Scriptural and Protestant, and unites Evangelical truth with Apostolical order ; and the Broad Churchman will tell you its chiefest merit lies in its being "the freest Church in Christendom ;" a characteristic due, he thinks, to its subordination to the State.

Clearly we get little help from these three irreconcilable descriptions, save that we gather the last must have some truth in it, since the same community can contain three such widely divergent parties. Liberalism, then, of a certain kind, is a primary characteristic of Anglicanism, and, as has been seen, a note not in favour of those who would maintain the sacerdotal character of its Ministry.

Nor is it hard to reconcile the existence of this mark with those conservative features which, as has been already allowed, the Church of England possessed for some two hundred and fifty years, and still to some extent retains. They are due in great measure to the national temperament, to the wealth and social position of the Anglican Church, to its intimate connection with the governing classes, to the stringency of its Acts of Uniformity and terms of subscription, now very considerably relaxed—in a word, to its Establishment. So soon as its internal dissensions shall have enabled the Nonconformists to sever it from the State and to sequester its endowments, we shall see little of this conservative temper left. Indeed,

already the thorough-going men of each of the three parties it contains are desirous of making many very considerable changes in its discipline and worship, and only await their opportunity. So that conservatism is only accidental to the Church of England, and cannot *per se* be held to testify to the sacerdotal character of its Ministry.

Attention has here been called, merely in passing, to the grave internal disunion which is characteristic of the Anglican Church ; and to the upholder of the sacerdotal theory of the Anglican Ministry might be further addressed an *argumentum ad hominem*, based on the outspoken opposition and even violence against the Anglican Bishops, which the men of his party from time to time exhibit. But it must suffice now to have indicated these two points, which are not among the marks of sacerdotal communities ; and to leave the other concessions we have made, and especially the retention of at least a nominal Hierarchy, to come before us more naturally at a later period in our discussion. It will be best next to notice how the origin and history of the Anglican Church, as a separate community, involve in many difficulties and inconsistencies those who accept the High Church estimate of its Ministry.

§ 8. *The Origin and Early History of Anglicanism Inconsistent with the High Church Estimate of Anglican Orders.*

The extreme Ritualist finds himself alone in being unable to establish any reasonable account of the English Reformation consistent with the facts, and with his own theory that, when the storm was past, the "Church of England," say in the year 1580, was "Catholic" still. The Low Churchman thanks God for the "glorious Reformation," which, as he conceives, liberated Evangelical truth from tyranny and superstition. The Broad Churchman is less enthusiastic, but yet maintains that the events of the sixteenth century were "a step in the right direction." And both these views, however false in themselves, are consistent with the position of those who hold them; nor will any one be found to deny the consistency of the Catholic view, though prejudice may hinder the admission of its justice.

The Catholic condemns the English Reformation as a miserable national apostasy, brought about by violence, covetousness, ambition and lust. He can hardly bear to think of the lamentable faithlessness of the Bishops and clergy, who, instead of guarding the goodly trust committed to them, weakly yielded to the fierce heretical will of Henry, Edward, and their advisers, and betrayed what they had sworn to defend. So again he shrinks with horror from the cynical craftiness of Elizabeth, to whose policy and cruelty was mainly due the consolidation of Anglicanism as the national religion. But, apart from his decided condemnation of those who brought about the change, and of the change they brought about, the Catholic can afford to do ample justice to all those who

were involved in it without their own fault. He can make every excuse for those who from childhood were taught that "Catholic" was but a synonym for "traitor," and that the Catholic religion was a mass of corruption and superstition. In other words, he can have good hopes that by far the greater number of those whom the Church of England has taught an imperfect faith, have lived and died in invincible ignorance of Catholicism. He condemns only those who have had the claims of the Church fairly before them, and have deliberately rejected her. With perfect consistency he can be at once both charitable and just.

But how differently must the Ritualist view the whole question! He finds himself, professing to hold all Catholic doctrine, a member of a community separated from the rest of the Catholic world, whose separation was in the end due (as men of all parties but his own admit) to the fact that much of the Catholic doctrine, to which he holds, was regarded by this community as false and corrupt. He finds himself, moreover, asserting a claim to the possession of priestly powers which his progenitors in Anglicanism repudiated with hatred and contempt. And so the exigencies of his position compel him to ignore, or at least to colour his view of, many of the proceedings of the English Reformers. He begins by exaggerating the corruptions alleged to have been prevalent in the mediæval Church of England; and he even goes so far as to assert that popular misbeliefs, amounting to heresy, existed far and wide. He can bring no proof of this assertion, but it is necessary to justify the separation from Rome, and the language of some of the Articles. And further, without approving of every detail, he is bound to hold that the Reformation was in the main a praiseworthy change; else he cannot defend his remaining in the community which

it formed. Yet it is not easy to see how he can venture to describe those principles as "Catholic," which, in 1560, permitted men to transfer their allegiance from the Catholic Bishops of London, Ely, and Lincoln (to give no other instances), whom Parliament had deprived, and to recognise as their lawful successors such Protestants as Grindal, Cox, and Bullingham, whose position (all question of consecration apart) was wholly illegitimate, save on extreme Erastian principles. Indeed, it is when the Ritualist proceeds to study the history of his Church in Elizabeth's reign, that his most serious difficulties begin; for he cannot repudiate all connection with the Elizabethan Protestant Church, as he might, perhaps, with the Edwardine; and to justify his own position within it, he has to maintain that the "priests" of Parker's ordination were in truth *sacerdotes*, sacrificing priests, and had all the powers of their predecessors in Catholic times.*

And here is the place to insist on a point which, though it would not of course be denied, is certainly often ignored. It is this, that if the High Church estimate of the Anglican Ministry be correct, it includes all the Anglican clergy from the first. Not merely those few men who now assert the sacerdotal character of their Orders, and who

* It is noticeable that High Churchmen do in fact refrain from any systematic treatment of the Elizabethan period. Mr. J. H. Blunt (who must not be confounded with another writer of the same name, the author of a spirited "Sketch of the Reformation" from the Puritan standpoint) published some time ago a "History of the Reformation," which stopped at the year 1547; and as yet nothing more has appeared. Dr. Lee writes "Historical Sketches of the Reformation," but he also barely gets beyond the reign of Henry VIII. And the Anglican Professors of Ecclesiastical History confine themselves to early periods; and do not venture to touch that which most intimately concerns the *status* of their own Church. And perhaps they are wise; for it may be doubted whether any High Churchman could give a full and fair consideration to the history of religion in England from the accession of Edward VI. to the death of Elizabeth, and still retain both his Catholic principles and his position in the Church of England.

act as priests, are concerned in the claim preferred ; but all their brethren, from 1560 to this day, stand or fall with them. If the modern Ritualistic priest, clothed in a chasuble, really consecrates the Body and Blood of Christ, so did the careless and faithless parsons of the eighteenth century, and so does every Anglican clergyman now, be he High or Low or Broad, and that, too, in Ireland and in America, and wherever else Anglicanism is found. This is a portentous fact, and should be seriously faced by those who have accepted the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, and who know that, if Anglican Orders are valid, a thousand material profanations of the Blessed Sacrament must be occurring weekly, while those that past years have witnessed would be simply countless. Is not the Catholic far happier in being assured that such wholesale dishonour to the Eucharistic Presence does not in fact continually take place on every side ? and does he not at the same time acquit the Anglican Ministry of having for three centuries proved itself utterly unworthy of the sacred Treasure committed to it ? a charge which is distinctly involved in the assertion we are engaged in questioning.

What, then, is the *primâ facie* evidence afforded by Anglicanism in Elizabeth's reign ? The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was denounced and blasphemed from every pulpit to which one of the new ministers gained access ; that is, from every pulpit in England before the sixteenth century expired. The ancient altars were destroyed, or put to some ignoble use ; and the mere name "Mass-priest" became a term of reproach. For near upon a hundred years the Communion Service of the Church of England was in all significant externals the same as that of the foreign Protestants, being celebrated at a common table in the middle of the church or chancel, while those

who received, stood or sat at their pleasure, and ministers with no pretence to Episcopal ordination were not excluded from its administration. What *primâ facie* evidence of sacerdotal character can be found in men who eagerly destroyed as superstitious the ancient liturgical books ; who for the same reason preferred to use at the Communion a common plate and cup, instead of the paten and chalice of Catholic times ; and who cut up the vestments of the old religion into gowns and bodices for their wives ?* Can any serious man, capable of picturing to himself the actual state of things during Elizabeth's reign in every parish to which an Anglican priest was appointed, gravely maintain that these men were Catholic priests, and not of an Order essentially different from the "Mass-priests" whom they so bitterly persecuted ? Yet, if they were not *sacerdotes*, neither are their successors in our own day ; for both came of the same stock.

Clearly, then, the advanced High Churchman has reason to shrink from studying the character of Anglicanism during at least the first fifty years of its existence. It is wholly inconsistent with his own theories. He clings with tenacity to one or two details which seem to favour his cause—the retention of the names of Bishop and priest, and the vague directions issued for the use of certain vestments—the significance of which points will be considered later ;† but he passes on as rapidly as

* See Froude's "History of England," vol. viii. p. 93 ; and compare Green's "History of the English People," p. 371.

† The re-introduction into the Prayer-book Calendar, as revised under Elizabeth, of certain "Black-letter Saints' Days," which had been omitted in 1552, is sometimes urged as an important witness to the "Catholicity" of the revision of 1558. But it should be noticed that no provision was then made, or ever has been made, for their observance. To this day "A Table of *all* the Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year" includes only the "Red-letter days," and the observance of the minor

possible to the "Anglo-Catholic" school of the seventeenth century, and then takes another leap into the "Catholic revival" of our own day. We will therefore follow him, and briefly estimate the value of the *primâ facie* evidence furnished by the history of Anglicanism between the close of the sixteenth century and the rise of the Tractarian movement.

estivals by Ritualists is an exercise, however pardonable, of private judgment. Mr. Procter thinks these days were again noted in the Calendar, as they conveniently marked the dates of local fairs and secular holidays; and Cobbett is no doubt correct in asserting that "it was necessary to preserve some of the names so long revered by the people, in order to keep them in better humour, and to lead them by degrees into the new religion." Other matters will come before us showing how skilfully the fall from Catholicism to Protestantism was broken by the astute advisers of Elizabeth.

§ 9. *The Fortunes of Anglicanism since the Sixteenth Century also Inconsistent with the Sacerdotal Theory of Anglican Orders.*

About the year 1590 appeared the first sign of a reaction towards some features of the Catholic system, to which the Church of England was subject for about a century ; from which period, however, must be excluded the seventeen years during which it was suppressed by the Commonwealth. The reaction ceased on the accession of William of Orange, but reasserted itself in the Tractarian movement, after the lapse of near upon a hundred and forty years. It has advanced with giant strides during the last quarter of a century, and so is calculated to give a false impression of the character of Anglicanism to those who have no means of knowing what that character has been in other times ; or who do not bear in mind that the stream cannot rise higher than its source, that the strength of a chain is the strength of its weakest link, and that what the Anglican body was in 1580, such it is essentially now, however much appearances may be changed. We must, however, inquire how far this reaction testifies to the reality of the Anglican Priesthood : and in the present section we will briefly sketch the fortunes of Anglicanism during the period ending with the first quarter of the present century.

The celebrated Richard Hooker is commonly accepted as the father of the Anglican system. He was a man of great learning, ability, and piety ; and his writings, most of which appeared during the later years of Elizabeth, laid the foundation on which others built. If we except his decided Erastianism, his principles, compared with those of his contemporaries, had a distinctly Catholic complexion. But, at the time that he wrote, his " Ecclesias-

tical Polity" was an ideal only to be found on paper ; and, indeed, his ideal of the Church of England was not what would now satisfy High Churchmen ; for a sacerdotal Ministry formed no necessary part of it. In sacramental doctrine he was below even the moderate High Church standard of modern times ; and on his death-bed he confessed to and received communion from a minister who had not been episcopally ordained.* Some of his language will be considered later.

The first two Stuarts, and especially James, recognised what stability to the throne ecclesiastical principles should give ; and in their day the Anglican Hierarchy assumed a more substantial form, under the patronage of, and in subordination to, the Crown. Thenceforward the Church of England has more or less consistently claimed to stand on a different level from the foreign Protestant communities, and has commonly adopted towards them an air of patronising superiority ; though at the same time she has had relations with them far more friendly than with the Roman Church ;† and, even in our own day, high Anglican dignitaries have joined in communion with non-Episcopal ministers both on the Continent and in America ; and that without rebuke from their ecclesiastical superiors, though the facts were well known.‡

* Saravia. He also was a man of some learning, and received marks of honour from several Anglican Bishops, being Rector of Great Chart, in Kent, and Prebendary of Gloucester, Canterbury, and Westminster. Nevertheless, his Orders were Dutch Protestant, and not Episcopal ; though, as a convert to Anglicanism, he was zealous for what seemed to him the peculiar features of the system. He died in 1613, having done not a little towards the foundation of the Jacobite quasi-Catholic revival. See Strype's "Life of Archbishop Whitgift," vol. ii. p. 202 (Oxford, 1822).

† The Church of England was officially represented by a Bishop and other divines at the Calvinistic Synod of Dort in 1618 ; and a century later Archbishop Wake wrote to Le Clerc, "*Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes, libenter amplector.*"

‡ "Persons of Lutheran, and Calvinistic, and Luthero-Calvinist bodies, are

The early years of the seventeenth century witnessed several features of the new Catholicising movement. A chapter on the Sacraments, more Catholic in tone than would have been possible in Elizabeth's reign, was added to the Catechism. Ecclesiastical canons were issued by authority, and enforced some kind of discipline on the clergy, among them being a rule for clerical dress, which in the previous reign had been much neglected. Various Anglican writers now began to follow Hooker in using quasi-Catholic language, and spoke, though vaguely, of altar and sacrifice.

Archbishop Laud was the most thorough-going and the most successful advocate of this new development. In his day hierarchical principles had been at work for forty years, and he succeeded in getting the communion-tables placed permanently against the east wall of the chancel and guarded by a rail. He also insisted on the rule of receiving the Sacrament kneeling, though it was still commonly handed round the church to the people in their places, a distinctively Protestant custom which has lasted in rare cases down to our own day.* Yet even Laud himself had no serious belief in the supernatural grace of Orders; or at least did not hold that a *virtus sacramentalis*,

and have been chosen without scruple by the English people for husbands and wives, for sponsors, for missionaries, for Deans and Canons, without any formal transition from communion to communion. The Anglican prelates write complimentary letters to what they call the foreign Protestant Churches, and they attend, with their clergy and laity, Protestant places of worship abroad." — "Difficulties of Anglicans," vol. i. p. 46.

In the present day High Churchmen attend the Catholic churches abroad, and even keep aloof from their own places of worship. But this is a very recent practice.

On the employment of foreign Protestants as Anglican missionaries, see Marshall's "Christian Missions," vol. i. p. 275. It appears that for years the only clerical representatives of the Church of England in India were German Lutherans, who had been ordained by Anglican Bishops, certainly, but who claimed to be Lutherans none the less.

* It was the practice at Christ Church, Oxford, until some ten years ago.

received in direct succession from the ancient Catholic Episcopate, was necessary to give character to his Hierarchy; for in his later years he confessed, what Catholics have always maintained, that the Anglican Bishops and priests differ only in name from the Lutheran Superintendents and Pastors.* And, indeed, this quasi-Catholic revival was but a very shallow affair. It was Erastian in origin, and never penetrated into the popular religion. Anglicanism showed its true character as a national institution, and a department of the royal *régime*, by being swept away, and after seventeen years restored, with the monarchical system of government.

But the influence of the Jacobite High Church movement was seen in the stricter ecclesiastical notions that came in with Charles II. Ministers without the legal Episcopal ordination were now formally excluded from positions in the Church of England.† The forms of ordination themselves received a sacramental flavour they

* "In Sweden they retain both the thing and the name; and the governors of their churches are, and are called, Bishops. And among the other Lutherans the thing is retained, though not the name. For instead of Bishops they are called Superintendents, and instead of Archbishops, General Superintendents. And yet even here, too, these names differ more in sound than in sense."—Laud's "Works" (Ang. Cath. Library), vol. iii. p. 386.

† Nevertheless, Archbishop Tillotson in 1689, in his scheme of "concessions which the Church would probably make," included the recognition as valid of foreign Protestant ordinations, though not those of the English Dissenters. The distinction is a witness to the essentially *national* character of Anglican Orders; and it is one which Low Churchmen in the present day would willingly admit. Probably a *catena* of Anglican authorities in its favour, from Archbishop Parker to Archbishop Tait, could without serious difficulty be found. The French Protestant service in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral is a witness to its recognition. And the grave significance of this admission of non-Episcopal ordination must not be overlooked. It is absolutely without parallel in the history of any community that has retained the true Priesthood; and it cannot be set aside as a mere temporary irregularity, due to the difficulties of the times when Anglicanism was first established; for it continued long after the great change had been effected. Nor can anything be made of the fact that the Anglican Church officially recognises the validity of Orders conferred by Catholic Bishops. All Protestant sects do the same; nor is it easy to see

had lacked during the previous hundred years, by the addition of the words "for the office and work of a Bishop," or, "of a priest in the Church of God," at the time of the imposition of hands. Moreover, the rubric in the Communion service gave the new title, "Prayer of Consecration," and obscurely hinted at the now famous "eastward position;" while directions, which had found no place in the Prayer-book for upwards of a century, were inserted, bidding the minister lay his hands on the bread, and take the cup into his hands, while reciting the words of institution. In short, the liturgical system was now (1662) brought up to its present official level, and has since undergone no legal change, save the authorisation of a rearrangement of the Scripture Lessons by the Act of 1871.

The additions, such as they were, are significant in two ways. They show the dissatisfaction of the revisers with the forms and rubrics as they found them; but, what is more important, they show how easily they were satisfied, and how little real progress had been made in a Catholic direction. The slight change in the form of ordination seems to have been merely intended to testify to Episcopal authority against Puritan cavillers; while the rubrics added to the Communion service do no more than secure a solemn setting apart, and a reverent use of the sacramental elements. Nothing was done indicating any belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Indeed, in one point a change was made for the worse; for a rubric was inserted permitting consecration in one kind, should there be occasion,—a permission incompatible with belief in the Sacrifice. Such an attempted consecration is, on Catholic principles, certainly sacrilegious and probably null.*

how they could do otherwise; for on principles both Anglican and Protestant, Catholic priests have been "too much ordained" already.

* This rubric had originally appeared in the "Order of Communion," put

The movement, however, continued during the reigns of the second Charles and James; but on the accession of William, the Catholicising spirit silently evaporated after the secession of the Non-jurors. These worthy men, having now no State recognition, had to stand or fall according to their ecclesiastical character, and so naturally laid stress on their claim to valid Orders. With them therefore hieratic principles were further developed; but at the highest point they reached they still fell short, very far short, of the Catholic doctrine on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They had no conception that in it Christ is truly offered by the priest for the living and the dead.* "They could not raise their minds to anything higher than the sacrifice of the material bread and wine, as representatives of One, who was not literally present, but absent;"† and one of their most "advanced" men, Dr. Brett, described as "corrupt, dangerous, superstitious, abominably idolatrous, theatrical, and utterly unworthy the gravity of so sacred an institution," the rubrics of the Catholic Missal, which nowadays Ritualists follow as nearly as possible to the letter, all the time regarding the High Churchmanship of the Non-jurors as a kind of justification for their proceedings. They were

forth in 1548. This shows that the English Reformers had abandoned all serious belief in the Mass, even before they published the first Reformed Prayer-book, which retained the name.

* The Anglican theory, that the ancient Church regarded the Eucharistic Sacrifice as a merely commemorative, and not as a true offering, and that the expression "to offer Christ" is purely mediæval and Roman,—is unsupported by evidence. "St. Cyril, about the year 344, declares to the newly baptised at Jerusalem, as the ancient universally acknowledged doctrine of this original Apostolic Church, *We offer the Christ who was slain for our sins.*" Döllinger's "Hippolytus," translated by Plummer, p. 320. Antiquity of course recognises fully the commemorative character of the Eucharist, as does the Catholic Church of to-day; but the point is that it does not regard the Sacrifice as *exclusively* a bare commemoration.

† "Difficulties of Anglicans," vol. i. p. 195.

men of learning and piety, no doubt; but they were infected with an utterly un-Catholic spirit. They employed their leisure in elaborating schemes for the "reunion of Christendom," as chimerical as some modern proposals; and it is significant of the instability of the Anglican system, apart from the State, that this community should so quickly have dwindled away, and, alone among the English Protestant sects, have come utterly to an end.*

It is not necessary to sketch the lethargy into which the Church of England sank under the Dutch and German sovereigns; for it is admitted on all hands that, from the beginning of the eighteenth century until the rise of Tractarianism, Protestantism reigned supreme and unquestioned within the Established Church. In other words, the temporary revival of the age of the Stuarts had quietly passed away, leaving hardly so much as a remembrance behind. It is not merely to the pluralism, absenteeism, and other abuses that were rife, that reference is made, nor to the unedifying lives led by so many of the clergy. Scandals of these kinds have not been unknown at certain periods in true branches of the Catholic Church, and they have no direct bearing on the question of Orders. But the state of the Anglican Church in the eighteenth century witnesses to the unreality of the Anglican Priesthood, inasmuch as it was characterised by an utter negation of all distinctively Catholic beliefs and practices whatsoever. If it is possible to maintain that the revival of the seventeenth century attained to a sacerdotal conception of the Christian Ministry (and there is no evidence that it did so in the full Catholic sense), it is certain that any such

* Nineteen Bishops were consecrated by the Non-jurors. They died out in 1805.

notion was completely extinguished in the eighteenth. More than that, sacramental doctrine shared the same fate almost as fully.* Baptismal regeneration was commonly denied by those who cared to discuss religious matters at all; and baptism itself was administered with scandalous negligence. Communion was but quarterly, even in town churches; and the mode of their celebration, though not perhaps devoid of a certain impressiveness, according to Protestant notions of the nature of the rite, was nevertheless inconsistent with any vestige of faith in a Divine objective Presence. Here and there, indeed, a so-called High Churchman might have been found, who held a theory of Apostolical Succession; but his theory was little more than an offshoot of his Tory political principles. He wished to establish his Churchmanship on a basis of "decency and order;" but his peculiar view had no further effect on his doctrine and practice, which were as Protestant as those of his neighbours. Equally with them he denounced the Mass and transubstantiation, nor did the idea ever occur to him that he ought himself to adore and elevate the Host.

Such has been the character of the Anglican Church

* In the sixteenth century "Sacramentarian" was another name for "Zwinglian." In the nineteenth century popular Protestantism thus designates High Churchmen; and they who preach about Sacraments, and insist on their necessity, arouse thereby suspicions that their "views" are "unsound." This is significant of the lapse from almost all definitely supernatural religion which Anglicanism has experienced, and which is absolutely without parallel in the history of any sacerdotal community. High Churchmen make much of the sacramental language contained in the Prayer-book services, Catechism and Articles, and regard it as convincing testimony to the "Catholicity" of their Church. They forget that it was sacerdotal rather than sacramental doctrine that the Reformation rejected; and that the Lutheran formularies, equally with the Anglican, insist on the importance and necessity of Sacraments; though they do not regard them as in themselves channels of supernatural grace, but as little else than solemn opportunities for making acts of justifying faith. It is not easy to see that the Elizabethan Prayer-book went any further than this.

until our own day, and such it remains in great measure still. Whatever then may be said as to the truth of the doctrines taught by the Ritualists, no one will be found to deny that they are utterly out of harmony with the ordinary traditions of the Church of England, which have from the first been thoroughly and consistently Protestant, in the sense of repudiating sacerdotalism, and in particular the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

§ 10. *Contrast of the Modern Claim, especially as Asserted in Practice.*

The sketch contained in the two preceding sections, of the character of Anglicanism as it has appeared in history, is necessarily brief, but not, the writer believes, unfair. The assertion that until quite recent times the Anglican system had shown no sign of a definitely sacerdotal character, will receive further justification when later in our discussion there is occasion to refer to certain historical details.

If, however, the impression produced by the facts just related be a just one, it can hardly be a matter for surprise that Catholics are so little disposed to admit as even probable the claim now advanced by perhaps a thousand of the Anglican clergy, that their Priesthood is in all respects the same as that of the Roman Catholic Church, and empowers them to say Mass and to administer the Sacrament of Penance. The claim is startling from its very novelty ; indeed, it may be safely asserted that probably not one of those who now so stoutly maintain it, and who look so brave in their magnificent vestments, has not in earlier years been at least momentarily conscious of the strange inconsistencies and even absurdities in which he was involving himself. Certainly he was not "to the manner born;" the Church of England of his childhood set before him no such model as he now himself displays to the rising generation ; and practice alone has blinded him to the fact that he is utterly out of harmony with his actual position. The "rough kind of logic" before referred to has driven him to accept a startling conclusion, perhaps even in spite of his own better judgment. "If we have valid Orders," he has argued, "and valid Orders we cer-

tainly have, they must be the real thing, for they can be nothing else ; and that means that the Mass and the Confessional are our proper work."

Thus, the novelty of the claim notwithstanding, it is urged with persistency and skill, and daily gains fresh adherents. But the majority of these are attracted, not so much by the cogency of moral, theological, or historical arguments, as by the uncompromising exhibition of the claim in practice. When educated and earnest men habitually act as priests, and in language, manner, and dress continually come nearer to the Catholic model ; when the Anglican Communion service almost escapes recognition, being enwrapped in the full Roman ritual ; when, half hidden in a cloud of incense, an Anglican clergyman, in alb and chasuble, stands before an altar ornamented with lights and flowers, genuflects, and lifts up the bread and the cup, while bells are sounded and Catholic hymns of adoration sung, it seems incredible that the performers in this ceremony should be, as in fact they are, no more priests than the ministers of Parker's ordination, who celebrated this same service in gown or coat, on a board placed on trestles ; and who, it is important to remember, had as boys been educated amidst this Catholic ceremonial worship, which their descendants attempt to reproduce, but who had also, with full knowledge of its nature and meaning, contemptuously rejected it as men.

There is the same dangerous persuasiveness in the modern High Church mode of conferring ordination, so different from what had been the rule until a very few years ago. That the old-fashioned system was after its kind impressive, and may well have left a fragrant memory in the minds of those who, in perfectly good faith, thought then and there to dedicate their lives to God, we have no need here to deny. But it was a distinctively Protestant

ceremony, and no external feature suggested that it was nearer to an administration of the Sacrament of Holy Order than a Wesleyan ordination of to-day. Perhaps the extraordinarily violent abjuration of the Pope's supremacy was the only reference to any doctrine that usually distinguishes Catholics from Protestants. But all this is now changed, and year by year more ceremonial borrowed from Catholic sources is introduced ; while the intention of those concerned in the ceremony is such that, if we admit the validity of the Anglican rite in itself, and also allow (as we do not) the true Episcopal character of the administrator, it is most probable that true priests would be ordained. Certainly the Bishop would as yet shrink from asserting that he is engaged in saying Mass, and in ordaining others to that end ; but he appears nevertheless with cope and pastoral staff, and the mitre is only a question of time. To the delight also of some who are present, he has "got so far" as to "adopt the eastward position," and to give the blessing at the end with the "correct" fingers ; and some of the candidates give quite a Roman flavour to the ceremony by appearing in cassock, cotta, and biretta ; while the most "advanced" among them furtively invest themselves with stoles, which even need not be black, after the imposition of hands.*

* The stole, one of the distinctively sacerdotal insignia of the Catholic ritual, is no vestment authorised by the Church of England, whether it be white, black, or coloured. None was ever worn by Anglican clergymen before 1840. Before that date chaplains and other dignitaries had worn scarves ; but this was the representative of another ancient ecclesiastical habit, significant, not of Priesthood, but of the personal dignity and office (*e.g.*, as Dean or Canon) of the wearer. The late Bishop Blomfield is said to have given verbal permission to any of his clergy who pleased to wear scarves, on the ground that they might all claim to be chaplains to their people. Soon after this began the High Church revival of ecclesiastical art, and the scarf, thus allowed, was gradually transformed into a stole. First it was narrowed ; then a black cross timidly appeared in relief on the ends ; soon the cross was of gold or coloured ; a little later white was substituted for black as the material of the

What is to be thought of the wholesale introduction of Catholic ceremonial into Anglican worship? Are Catholics to condemn it unreservedly, or may they admit it has certain redeeming features? If Anglican Orders were valid beyond question, the Ritualist could no doubt defend what he does as consistent with his position (apart from the questions of heresy and schism), and as a reparation for past negligence. But what when they are not? Certainly then the adoption of an expressive ritual is deplorable to the last degree; for it employs the recognised witnesses to great Catholic truths in bearing false testimony to errors in fact, and so tends to weaken the value of their testimony when legitimately used within the Catholic Church. Indeed, if Anglican clergymen are not true priests, the famous condemnation of their "Mass in masquerade" is only too severe in so far as this, that it seems to imply on the part of the performers a deliberate intention to ridicule the action they imitate, which is certainly not the case.

On the other hand, since "imitation is the sincerest flattery," the proceedings of the Ritualists bear witness

whole; then came violet, red and green, as the people were able to bear it, or perhaps insisted upon it; later still gorgeous mediæval embroidery, with monograms and saints, decorated the High Church clergyman; and now finally the "advanced" man protests that no stole is "correct" unless it be made after the precise Roman pattern. In fact, the ingenuity of ecclesiastical tailors, stimulated by the researches of High Church archæologists and tourists, and not any rubric, or canon, or Convocation, or Bishop, or Synod, is the sole authority on which the wearing of stoles by Ritualists depends; and the little ceremony of self-investiture referred to above, is perhaps deserving of being retained by the Church of England, since it witnesses to the fact, which this Essay is designed to make clear, that the Ritualistic priest does not receive sacerdotal character in his ordination, but confers it upon himself. In the Catholic rites the Bishop invests the deacon or priest with the stole, using these words in either case: "*Accipe stolam candidam de manu Dei; adimple ministerium tuum: potens enim est Deus, ut augeat tibi gratiam suam; qui vivit et regnat in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.*" "*Accipe jugum Domini; jugum enim ejus suave est, et onus ejus leve.*"

unwillingly, and therefore all the more forcibly, to the value and necessity, as well as to the attractive beauty and expressiveness, of Catholic ritual ; and this testimony must in time bear fruit. Moreover, they break up the cold traditions of Protestant worship, and force on the attention of English-speaking people, all the world over, the fact that doctrines and practices, which the Roman Catholic Church has never for one moment let slip, have retained every sign of vigorous life, and are as much demanded by the instincts of the human heart that "make for righteousness" in this nineteenth century, as they were in the Middle Ages. And when men have been brought to realise, perhaps through the medium of Ritualism, the truth and necessity of what the Reformation rejected, they will be in a fair way to draw the conclusion that that Church must be divine, which, in spite of every human inducement, never swerved from her old teaching ; and they will hasten to enrol themselves in her ranks.

Perhaps, then, the modern Ritualistic movement, which to most Catholics, especially if they have been such from childhood, seems so foolish as hardly to deserve notice, may become in course of time the means of leading many into the Church ; though temporarily it retains some outside. The very extravagance of its claims, and their inconsistency with the previous history of Anglicanism, to which the last three sections have called attention, will have weight in this direction.

§ 11. *The Anglican Custody of the Eucharist ; a Reply to the Argument Considered.*

It has already been pointed out that valid Orders involve a valid Eucharist, and that the treatment which the Eucharistic elements have ordinarily received at the hands of Anglican clergymen is *primâ facie* evidence that they were not and are not true priests. Why should we go out of our way to place in their hands what they never claimed to possess ?

In reply to this argument, which is admitted to be weighty, Anglicans have adduced the case of careless, immoral, or even infidel priests, who have no doubt been found from time to time within the Catholic Church ; and they have gone on to assert that whole districts have before now been burdened with such unworthy pastors, and that during some considerable period.*

* A notable example of this *tu quoque* argument is to be found in a letter from an Anglican clergyman, which, together with a reply, was printed in the *Month* for October, 1868. An extract from this last is given in the Appendix, Note XI.

It is singular that a writer, who appears not to be ignorant of the difficulties with which anything that can be called a proof of the validity of Anglican Orders is surrounded, who admits that "the whole question involved is a life and death one to us poor Anglicans," and who goes on to say :—"I feel sure that in God's own good time it will come to pass that Anglicans will also see that it is God's will that they should submit to the Holy Apostolic See, and that it is their duty, as well as their privilege, to be in communion with that Bishop, who alone is the true successor of St. Peter, and by Divine Providence the Primate of the Catholic Church. The lurid murky flame of Protestantism, enkindled in the sixteenth century, is rapidly becoming quenched, and the true light of the Gospel, which twice before came to England from Rome, is once more beginning to beam upon us from the Eternal City, where the Prince of the Apostles, and the Doctor of the Gentiles, shed their blood :"—it is singular that a man, so peculiarly Roman in his sympathies, should be content to risk his salvation outside the Roman Church, deferring this submission until such time as the Anglican clergy shall "believe in their Priesthood and act upon it." And it is a strange commentary on his own words

This, however, is not a reply, but a retort, and is capable of being shown irrelevant. First, the accusation itself must be received with caution. There has never existed in the world an order of men more grossly and more persistently calumniated than the Catholic Priesthood. It has been as the Founder of the Order foretold. If a thousand priests lead lives which when examined cannot fail to be pronounced blameless, this is with the world no evidence that the rest who have not been examined are not villains ; whereas the discovery of a single black sheep among them is clear proof that they are. That there have been bad priests no one denies ; but that, under ordinary circumstances, they must be very rare, will be admitted by those who know anything of the strictness of Catholic discipline. And, as to wholesale accusations against districts or periods, we must be sure of the character and motives of the accuser, and of the trustworthiness of his sources of information, before we accept them in full. So long, indeed, as Almighty God chooses men and not angels to be the priests of his Church, it cannot but be that scandals will arise. But the known hostility of the world to the Church should forbid us to lend too ready an ear to charges which are at least antecedently improbable.

Admitting, however, for the sake of argument that the accusations are just, there would still be no parallel between the two cases. No doubt, so far as the individuals are concerned, the unfaithful Catholic priests come off worse than the Anglican ministers, who can urge the plea of ignorance of the nature of their Eucharist, supposing it really to be a true one. But this is not the point at issue.

that, after the lapse of ten years, he should himself appear as a member of the "O. C. R.," thus admitting the doubtfulness of that Priesthood, and yet as far as ever from submission to Rome.

It is not a question of unfaithful men, but of an unfaithful Church. The advocate of the validity of Anglican Orders inculcates the vast majority of the Anglican clergy in the charge of profanation of the Eucharist ; or if he attempts to excuse the men, on the ground that they acted in ignorance, he brings a far more serious charge against the Anglican Church, for not having provided a protective ritual, and for having taught her children to offer no worship to the Eucharistic Presence. Nor does he mend his case by incriminating Catholic priests as well. On the other hand, if the conclusion at which this Essay is aimed be correct, the Anglican Church indeed is shown not to be what the Ritualists assert, but the Anglican clergy are acquitted of unfaithfulness to a solemn trust committed to them. And, if cases of profanation of the Eucharist by unworthy Catholic priests are admitted to have occurred, the Catholic Church herself is not included in the condemnation that must be passed on the men ; for she at least has taught her children in unmistakeable terms what to believe and what to do with regard to the Blessed Sacrament ; and if they neglect to obey her, they alone are to blame. In other words, the conduct of a bad Catholic priest is confessedly in conflict with the teaching, discipline, and ritual to which he is bound ; whereas, Anglicans, in withholding all worship from their Sacrament, and in being indifferent to the remains after Communion, have only acted conformably to the traditions they have inherited. Until a few years ago, if any clergyman had asserted so much as the doctrine of the Real Presence, let alone that of the Mass, in unambiguous terms, he would thereby have proved that his "views" were "unsound," and he would have cut himself off from all chance of high ecclesiastical preferment. Whereas, who ever heard that, when a man had been selected by the Crown to fill a

vacant Bishopric, it was objected, as a proof of his unfitness for the post, that at the end of his quarterly communions he had habitually poured out of the vestry window what remained in the chalice, and had fed his chickens with the superfluous bread? Yet such and similar acts were common only a few years back, and are not unknown now.

These irregularities are not here referred to with the view of paining High Churchmen, nor indeed of condemning those who thus manifested their disbelief in any objective Presence in their Eucharist. If the Catholic estimate of Anglicanism be correct, there was nothing specially culpable in these acts; though perhaps, on any theory of the Eucharistic rite, they can hardly be acquitted of irreverence, or at least of negligence. Such acts on the part of Catholic priests, or indeed of any true priests, even though heretics and schismatics, would of course be sacrilegious to the last degree; but their occurrence is barely conceivable, save in some case of half insane infidelity. The fact, however, that such things could be done without any conscious irreverence by some of the most worthy and most highly honoured of the Anglican clergy, is strong *primâ facie* evidence of the unsacerdotal character of the Anglican Church, and of its identity in this matter with other Protestant Churches, wherein disbelief in an objective Presence is similarly manifested without blame. In short, the Catholic, when he has condemned the supreme act of apostasy by which the Church of England was formed, has no need to find further fault with that Church's teaching concerning the nature of its own Eucharist, nor with the mode of treating the sacramental elements usual among its ministers; whereas the High Churchman is compelled by his theory to condemn as material sacrilege the continually repeated actions of

nearly all the Anglican clergy ; and further to condemn the continuous unfaithfulness of his own Church during the past three hundred years, at the present time, and for an indefinite period in the future, in not insisting on any sort of due reverence towards what he believes to be the true Body and Blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine.

For with regard to this culpable negligence of the Anglican Church, supposing her to possess a true Eucharist, it must be borne in mind that she had existed for more than a hundred years before even that rubric was inserted which now prescribes the reverent consumption of what remains. This direction was due to the feeble Catholicising instincts of the Jacobite revival ; and it has not been scrupulously observed. In the present day some would seek stringently to enforce it, in order to prevent reservation and adoration of the remains. No one thought of such things in 1662 ; and in the previous century it would have been held folly and superstition to take any care of the superfluous elements. Yet even this rubric is by itself no sufficient protection, for it does not direct any ablutions such as the Church uses ; and their unauthorised introduction is a complete novelty in Anglicanism. Now the divine Presence exists under any appreciable quantity of the Holy Eucharist in either kind as fully as under the whole contents of the ciborium or chalice. It follows then, that if Anglican Orders are valid, every Communion service, with the rarest exceptions, and they only in our own day, has involved some material profanation of the Eucharistic Presence ; and this state of things must continue indefinitely. For, although the Ritualistic mode of celebration becomes daily more common, and is as reverent as could be wished, the old-fashioned system exists far more extensively alongside of

it ; and no serious person anticipates that the whole Anglican Church, with all its branches, and all its parties, Low and Broad as well as High, will ever be converted to Ritualism. Nothing better is expected than that one day the Catholicising school will become powerful enough to drive out the rest ; who will go on their way, possessing (*ex hypothesi*) a true Priesthood and Eucharist, but yet maintaining the traditional Protestant doctrine and practice with regard to them.

Moreover, it should be pointed out, with reference to this question of a valid Eucharist, that, although the external treatment it receives forms the best witness to the estimate of its nature as accepted by Catholics or Protestants respectively ; yet that no external irreverence can be in itself so serious a dishonour as the internal irreverence offered by priests who celebrate, or by communicants who receive, in mortal sin. And here, again, the theory of the validity of Anglican Orders involves very grave consequences. In the Catholic Church, Mass is said and communion is received only by those whose souls have been cleansed from sin, rare and special circumstances excepted, by confession and absolution, and who have received permission to approach the Holy Table. Generally speaking, every communion made has been preceded by sacramental absolution. On the other hand, the Church of England has no such discipline. The obsolete rubrics prefixed to the Communion service only contemplate the case of public sinners, and demand no absolution even for them before they can receive communion. Practically the Anglican Church has been, and is, the laxest of all Protestant communities in "fencing her tables ;" and this fault is so far from being remedied, that, at the present day, High Churchmen seek by all means to increase their number of communicants, though they can do nothing to

assure themselves of the interior worthiness of those whom they succeed in assembling. Even in the few extreme Ritualistic churches the communicant who has been to confession is the exception and not the rule ; and the Anglican clergyman, who obtains what he thinks is absolution before "celebrating," is a rarer exception still. A Catholic of course does not wish to accuse Anglicans of being worse than other people, nor does he deny that at Catholic altars unworthy communions from time to time are made ; but it is obvious that, if Anglican Orders are valid, the Holy Eucharist is in Anglican churches exposed to a danger of being continually administered to unworthy recipients, such as is absolutely without parallel elsewhere.

Who, then, would not hope that this theory, which makes the Anglican Church and her clergy, with but a handful of exceptions, unfaithful to the gift entrusted to them, and which thus involves profanations so numerous and so grave, past, present and future, may prove to be as baseless as Catholics are persuaded it is? They at least need not believe that they live in a country where for centuries the Sacramental Jesus has been, is, and will be, habitually dishonoured at the hands of schismatical and heretical priests.

§ 12. *Alleged Witness of the Modern Revival to the
Validity of Anglican Orders.*

There is nothing surprising in the fact that the mere existence and progress of the "Catholic revival" within the Church of England should be taken by those concerned in the movement as *prima facie* evidence in favour of the substantial nature of the Anglican Priesthood. *Si testimonium quæris, circumspice*, is a short and often very telling argument. "Can any other Church be found," it is asked, "in which sacramental and sacerdotal doctrines have asserted themselves after a period of lethargy, and have made way both in theory and practice, while yet the grace of Orders was absent?"

If, in reply to this query, it be allowed that the history of the sects furnishes perhaps no precise parallel to the fortunes of Anglicanism in this matter, it must be added that neither can any similar case be found in the history of the sacerdotal communities; for the reason that none of them has ever experienced anything corresponding to that so-called "period of lethargy" to which the Anglican Church has been subject. For this period, when rightly estimated, has not merely to do with the deadness and indifference of the eighteenth century. The negation, at least of sacerdotal doctrine, began with the first beginning of the Church of England as a separate community, and is by no means over now. In fact, it is no mere question of "lethargy," but of fierce and persistent denial. Sacerdotal communities have had no doubt their times of decadence, and their times of revival; but not such as can be compared with the career of the Church of England. They have been infected, it may be, with superstition, or have yielded to temptations to negligence, and

even to lax morality. But surely no example can be found of a "Church," which, while really possessing the Priesthood, not merely ignored, but even stigmatised, and that consistently for centuries, as corrupt, false, and anti-Christian, those privileges which the possession involved. Should Anglican Orders prove to be valid, it will have to be confessed that the case is without parallel in any part of Christendom.

If then we were to allow that the history of Protestant sects contains nothing exactly corresponding to the modern Ritualistic movement, we should have to add that no argument in favour of the "Catholicity of the Anglican Church" could be based on this, since the absence of any parallel case extends to the sacerdotal communities as well. The only legitimate deduction would be that the Church of England occupies an unique and isolated position with regard to the rest of the Christian world; and this is surely no testimony to its Catholicity.

But perhaps it is not so clear that the Church of England is singular among Protestant communities in experiencing a "Catholic revival." Various circumstances, which will be referred to later, may combine to render specially prominent and pronounced that which is now going on within her; but a similar movement is in progress among the Congregationalists and the Wesleyans, and of course the case of the Irvingites is more remarkable still. Moreover, the state of the Lutheran Churches abroad is in several ways analogous to that of the Church of England.

The external characteristics of Lutheranism differ widely in different countries. In Norway and Sweden it retains the external appearance of the ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and asserts that it possesses the Apostolical Succession at least as confidently as does the Church of

England. Moreover, as has already been noted, it has preserved a ceremonial tradition, unbroken since the Reformation, such as would gladden the heart of many a Ritualist, could he but find its parallel in his own Church. Its doctrine on the Holy Eucharist, though heretical, is not so far removed from what Catholics believe as that which has been ordinarily held in the Church of England, the Real Presence being distinctly and unequivocally asserted.* Evidently, then, the Scandinavian Church is in possession of all the requisites for a "Catholic revival;" which, indeed, is said to be already beginning to manifest itself in certain places. They are, may-be, a little behind the age; but nevertheless it may be confidently asserted that in less than fifty years the Lutherans of Norway and Sweden will be witnesses, *mutatis mutandis*, of all the phenomena of Ritualism, such as they are now found in England and America. And yet the Scandinavian Bishops are confessed by Ritualists to be mere laymen in relation to the Priesthood of the Catholic Church.

If we look next to Germany, its native land, we find that there the fortunes of Lutheranism have not differed materially from those of the Anglican Church. It has given birth to sects; it has lost its hold over the mass of the population; various conflicting parties have found a home within it, notably an advanced Rationalism in these latter days; while contemporaneously a quasi-Catholic reaction finds an increasing number of adherents among its clergy of a certain school, who teach high sacramental doctrine, and hold missions and retreats; while, in spite of

* It is noticeable that Laud, in defending the doctrine of the Real Presence as being that of the Church of England, does so on the plea that it was the doctrine of the foreign Protestants as well. He cannot therefore have held with modern High Churchmen that it is effected only by the consecration of a true priest. "Works" (Ang. Cath. Library), vol. ii. p. 328.

their efforts, or perhaps rather in consequence of them, the mass of the educated laity recede in a Liberal direction, and withdraw more and more from all connection with the Reformed Church. Anglicanism and Lutheranism each started with a distinctive doctrine, which at first gave them coherence and strength. The one was that the Pope is Anti-Christ; the other, that faith alone justifies. Both heresies have, in process of time, been quietly laid aside, save by individuals here and there; and thenceforward the process of disintegration has begun. If then the parallel between the two communities does not hold good in the matter of Orders (as Catholics maintain it does), it is at least striking in all other respects.

Indeed, the modern High Church revival, undoubtedly successful as it is up to a certain point, presents no difficulty to the Catholic, who does not acknowledge Anglican Orders, which would not be vastly increased had he to allow their validity. He would then have serious anomalies to account for, whereas now all, or nearly all, that he sees can be fairly illustrated by parallel cases. He does not underrate the importance of the Ritualistic movement; but he sees in it a testimony, not to Anglican Orders, but to Catholic truth. It is an acknowledgment of the insufficiency of popular Protestantism; but it is difficult to see how, on its own principles (assuming these to consist of more than a mere *dilettante* æstheticism), it can have any legitimate end save the Roman Catholic Church, slow though it be to recognise that end. It teaches its children to abhor heresy and schism; but where will they find any sure test of either, or any secure refuge from them, save in a full and loyal acceptance of the faith and discipline of the Vicar of Christ?

And, just as the Catholic has no difficulty in ascertaining the legitimate end of Ritualism, so also he is able

to account for its origin and strength. It is, in spite of many errors, imperfections, and false principles, with which those who are concerned in the movement, seem often quite gratuitously to mar their work, God's way of leading the English people back to Catholic unity. It is therefore a divine work, in so far as it is restorative and progressive towards that end ; but it is human, and stained with sin and error, in so far as it constitutes itself an end and not a means ; and it is wholly evil and damnable (to use a strong though perfectly appropriate word), when it brings sacred things into contempt, and infuses a captious and disobedient spirit into its adherents.

It is not wonderful that, at a time when all Christian bodies, however widely separated from the Roman Church, are experiencing a renewal of zeal, the Anglican Church should be the most profoundly affected of all. She has, in the Providence of God, preserved so much of the groundwork of the Catholic faith, that there is a rich soil in which zeal can grow. She has retained, in the ancient Creeds, the full Catholic doctrines concerning the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation ; and therein is contained in germ all, and more than all, that the Ritualists teach. It is not too much to say that the success of the High Church movement is mainly due to the continual public recitation throughout the Anglican Church of the ancient Catholic symbols (and especially that of St. Athanasius), of so many Catholic prayers and hymns, and of the English Psalter, replete as it is with Catholic language and ideas. With the ground thus well prepared, it is not surprising that able and energetic men, with a number of favourable circumstances to back them, have been able to produce marked results. Nor do Catholics deny that the grace of God has coöperated with these men ; for indeed without

that they could have done no positive good.* All they maintain is, that the existence and success of the Ritualistic movement are not to be taken as evidence of the "Catholicity of the Anglican Church," or of the possession by Anglican clergymen of those special powers and graces, which are found only in conjunction with valid Orders.

* See "The Workings of the Holy Spirit in the Church of England," a Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., by Henry Edward Manning, D.D. Longman, 1864. This letter was the immediate occasion of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon."

§ 13. *Primâ Facie Evidence of the Character of the Anglican Episcopate.*

It will already have been observed that in this Essay the validity of Anglican Orders is impugned mainly on the ground of there being a substantial difference between the Anglican Priesthood and that of the Catholic Church. The nature and value of the Anglican Episcopate come before us less directly. In fact, there is no need to question more than one out of the two Orders. Both fall together if either the one or the other cannot be maintained. There can be no priests without Bishops to ordain them, nor can a Bishop be truly such in the Catholic sense, if he be not first of all, also in the Catholic sense, a priest.* The functions of a true Bishop are eminently sacerdotal. His daily Mass, though not distinctively characteristic of his office, is his greatest work; and he is, in subordination to the successor of St. Peter, the holder of the keys, the sole channel through which flow all the absolutions pronounced within his diocese.

* Thus, if we were to allow the sufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal to consecrate a true Bishop, and, in addition to the fact of Parker's consecration, were to admit that, either Barlow was a true Bishop, or else that the coöperation of his three assistants, or of any one of them, sufficed to effect a valid consecration, still, if we succeeded in showing the insufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal to ordain a true priest in the Catholic sense, we should have to maintain that anyhow the Anglican succession failed when Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury. He held the See twenty years, and consecrated not only Bancroft, his successor, but also all those who assisted him in that act. Whatever therefore there be substantial in the Anglican succession (apart from the alleged effect of the coöperation of an Italian apostate, De Dominis, and of certain Irish prelates, in some consecrations in the seventeenth century, a point that will be considered later), passed through Whitgift's hands. And he, unlike Parker and Grindal, had never been a Catholic priest, but was one of the first to be ordained according to the Anglican rite. If therefore that ceremony left him a layman in relation to the Catholic Priesthood, his consecration as Bishop of Worcester, by Grindal in 1577, left him a layman still.

As is well known, in Patristic times the term *Sacerdotium* was applied *par excellence* to the Episcopal office. All then that has been said with regard to the ordinarily unsacerdotal character of the Anglican Priesthood applies with even greater force (for it has been the rule, with barely an exception) to the Anglican Episcopate.

But the office of a Bishop has also a distinctive sphere, that of government ; and a brief consideration of the part which Anglican prelates commonly play in this sphere, if they attempt to enter it at all, will provide us with one more element of *primâ facie* evidence against the validity of Anglican Orders.

The Sacrament of Holy Order was not instituted merely for the purpose of continuing the succession of ministers in the Church. It does this, but it does more. It confers, *ex opere operato*, various graces on those who receive it, the graces in each case necessary for the due discharge of the functions of that office to which the recipient is promoted. Now, foremost among the distinctive duties of a Bishop comes that of judging. He has to judge persons and their doctrine, so as to preserve inviolate the unity and purity of the Catholic faith. *Episcopum oportet judicare* :—such are the first words in which the Archbishop warns the Bishop-elect of the greatness of the office that is to be conferred upon him.* And who has not admired the unity and decision with which the Catholic Bishops throughout the world discharge this weighty function ? It can be no mere natural courage, or discernment, or tact ; no mere obstinacy of will, that

* The Bishop's judicial office is twofold ; it concerns both faith and morals. The latter he judges mainly *in foro interno*, in the tribunal of Penance, whether directly, or indirectly, through the priests of his diocese. Here, however, we are only concerned with him as judge of doctrine. The other aspect of his office will come before us later.

enables them thus fearlessly and faithfully to condemn the false and to maintain the true ; it is the outcome of that *virtus sacramentalis* which in their consecration they have received.

There is hardly need to ask whether the Anglican Bishops possess this same characteristic. They are men of wide and varied learning, uniting refinement and culture with hospitality, goodness, and sincere piety ; but they are not, and do not profess to be, champions of the faith. It is not their ideal to contend boldly for principles, to defy the world's opinion, and to suffer the loss of all things rather than surrender an iota of the Creed.* They barely so much as profess to hold the place of ruler or judge. True spiritual jurisdiction, indeed, they never have had ; and even that poor substitute for it, which, together with a quasi-ecclesiastical Court for its exercise, they formerly possessed, as delegates of the Crown, they have within the last few years tamely, if not gladly, handed over to a purely secular judge, by whose decisions they are themselves bound. In all their public conduct their aim is (and that consistently with their position) to be moderate, to conciliate opposing views, to yield an inch here and an ell there, to observe and follow the general current of public opinion. Indeed, on account of the wide divergence in views and principles among those whom they are supposed to govern, their position would soon become intolerable if they attempted any other line. They have to be "all things to all men" in a sense very different from that which the Apostle intended.† On

* It is not so long since both the English Archbishops were willing, if not anxious, to abandon the public use of the Athanasian Creed ; and that with the view of conciliating men who notoriously objected, not merely to the expediency of its recitation, but to the truth of some of its articles.

† St. Francis of Sales, in the prayer for his feast, is proposed by the Church as a prelate who was truly *omnibus omnia*. In his case, however, gentleness of

Monday the Anglican Bishop shows hospitality to one of his High Church clergy, perhaps even hears his confession, certainly expresses great interest in and satisfaction with his work, and conveniently ignores the fact that the previous day his guest had appeared in chasuble and biretta, had swung a censer, and had elevated the Host. On Tuesday he presides at a Low Church missionary meeting, and listens with apparent gratification to the fervid denunciations of the Mass as "idolatrous," and of confession as a "Romish corruption" which the "deputation" conceived it opportune to utter. And on Wednesday he is happy to find himself in the serener atmosphere of some *quondam* professor's snug country parsonage; and in the evening, after dinner, reads "with great interest, though not of course agreeing with every word," the proof-sheets of a forthcoming work, in which his host not altogether obscurely indicates his opinion that "Christianity, though freer, no doubt, from error than any previous so-called revelation, must in time give place to, or rather itself be transformed into, a freer, fuller, and more Catholic religion, when God shall indeed be all in all;" and that, meanwhile, in view of this consummation, which the Professor's book is designed to accelerate, "men should reflect on the solemn truth that they are children of a common Father, and agree to differ, or if they differ, differ to agree." One need not go far to find some such pious Broad Church jargon as this.

Who can wonder if those Anglicans, who have pronounced views in one direction or another, complain that "the Bishops have no back-bone?" How can they act uniformly

disposition, and courteous affability in his dealings with those who were in good faith outside the Church, were united with the strictest loyalty to every detail of the Catholic faith, and the warmest devotion to the Holy See. He is said to have converted 72,000 Protestants.

on definitely dogmatic principles, when they are the most prominent members of a community which was confessedly founded on compromise,—that is, on the principle (if such it can be called) of including in the same national association men of widely divergent religious opinions? High Churchmen, who in the newspapers or at public meetings abuse their Bishops for “betraying the Catholic faith,” and who place them in necessarily unfavourable contrast with the Catholic Pontiffs of other centuries, or (as they consistently should add) of other lands in our own day, would be wiser if, before passing sentence, they took into consideration the question what Anglican prelates really are. Are they in fact Bishops in the Catholic sense? If so, their conduct is wholly indefensible. But what if they are not? Then their Episcopal character has relation only to their own Church; they are, from the Catholic point of view, simply pious laymen, occupying, certainly, positions which Catholic Bishops once held, and to which functions more or less ecclesiastical are still attached by law; but nevertheless they are not real Bishops, and at their consecration they received no spiritual power, as distinct from mere external authority, such as would enable them to act a part, which indeed they do not profess to be theirs, and which is against their protest thrust upon them by those who proceed to abuse them for not fulfilling it. If Anglican prelates can reconcile with their own consciences what seems not unlike a loose holding to any definite faith beyond the bare articles of the Apostles’ Creed (and on Liberal principles there is no doubt that they can), Catholics have no occasion to condemn, or even to be surprised at conduct, which would be inconceivable in the case of their own Bishops.

The *primâ facie* evidence against the validity of Anglican Orders, derived from the ordinary characteristics

of the Anglican Episcopate, is capable of further illustration.

From time to time in the history of the Catholic Church it has occurred that some royal favourite has been seated on an Episcopal throne mainly through the influence of the Prince, who hoped thus to secure a tool for carrying out designs hostile to the interests of the Church. What ordinarily has been the result of this policy? Some well-known instances might be adduced to answer the question. The man is consecrated and enthroned, and is the subservient courtier no longer. *Loquebar de testimoniis tuis in conspectu regum, et non confundear*. Neither threats nor violence suffice to persuade him to concede an inch to any encroachment attempted on the privileges of the Church; and for an iota of the faith he would willingly suffer death. Here is seen the power of the supernatural grace of Orders.

On the other hand, if an Anglican clergyman is elevated to the Episcopal bench, who before his promotion, either at college or in his parish, had vigorously followed out a definite course of action, and had been clear and outspoken as to what he did or did not believe; is it not a common subject for complaint even among Anglicans themselves, that after a few months as a Bishop, and without any pressure save from public opinion, he sinks to the ordinary Episcopal level, his "views" become colourless, his one aim appears to be to stand well with all parties, but favouring the most powerful; while, in the evenly-balanced controversies of the day, no one can tell what his convictions really are? He deprecates all extremes, and he is attacked by all; he finds that ideally to wear a mitre is no enviable honour; not because of any conflict he has to wage with the world, but because of the uncertainty of the faith he has to teach, and the insubordination of those he

has to rule. If these men, with all their great excellences as scholars and gentlemen, were indeed *Pontifices, Summi Sacerdotes*, "crowned and robèd seers," Catholics would be at a loss to account for their conduct ; but as things are, they have no difficulty in finding the explanation.

§ 14. *Summary of the Primâ Facie Evidence.*

In the sixth section above were given some of the characteristic marks of sacerdotal communities, and in the seven succeeding sections have been noted some of the more prominent characteristics of Anglicanism, as they have been recorded in history, or may be seen in the present day. It will hardly be denied that there is a sharp contrast between the two. Other details might still be adduced, which would similarly form *primâ facie* evidence of the nullity of Anglican Orders; but enough has been said. The history of Anglicanism will again come before us in that part of our discussion which we are now approaching; it is therefore here only appealed to as witnessing to the assertion that the Anglican clergy have, with the full sanction of their Church, habitually treated the sacramental elements in a manner wholly inconsistent with the theory of their Church having retained a true Eucharist. And if this be so, it follows of course that the Anglican system does not include the true worship of Sacrifice; indeed, we have seen that the modern claim of a few of her clergy to be Mass-priests is quite out of keeping with the most consistent of Anglican traditions, since the Church of England began to exist as a separate community. Moreover, the utter want of dogmatic unity, and the absence of any recognised test by which to judge heretical doctrine, have further testified to the correctness of the Catholic estimate of Anglicanism, as a merely human and Protestant system.

In short it comes to this, that we cannot trace within the Church of England anything that can be called a tradition of any one of those distinctive marks of sacerdotal communities to which reference has been made.

Here or there one or other of them may have been the private opinion or practice of an individual ; but he was confessedly out of harmony with the system under which he lived, and his peculiar view was tolerated only by a Liberal principle of inclusion. A general and continuous tradition of those marks there certainly has not been.

The writer is, of course, aware that a good deal of quasi-Catholic language may be found in the works of the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century, and that a judicious selection from these might be made, which would seem to give to the Anglicanism of that period at least a character considerably unlike that which these pages have ascribed to it as a whole. But he contends that casual expressions, which may not always on examination be found to mean what the same words from a Catholic pen would mean, cannot suffice to explain away the ordinary and consistent practice of Anglican clergymen ; and that if Anglican writers are appealed to, they must be taken *en masse*, and their general sense as far as possible ascertained, and not those of only one particular school be consulted. But, of course, the official documents, the Prayer-book, Articles and Homilies are of greater authority than any individual writers can be, and are more easily accessible. And from these alone it can be shown that the Church of England, as such, has never deplored her isolation from Rome, has never attributed to her ministers mysterious powers, has authorised no richly symbolical ritual, has totally rejected the old sacrificial worship, has only tolerated confession as an exception, has not recognised celibacy as the higher state, has not favoured the observance of the Evangelical counsels, has destroyed devotion to the Blessed Virgin, has ignored the intercession of the Saints, has denied the existence of

Purgatory, and has not sanctioned a single prayer for the faithful departed.

These are sweeping charges ; but since all who are acquainted with Anglicanism and its history, High Churchmen alone excepted, acknowledge their truth, the writer may leave to others the task of proving them in detail. And if they are just, they furnish a strong testimony to the nullity of Anglican ordinations, for they demonstrate an utter unlikeness between the Church of England and any sacerdotal community in ancient or modern times.

The completeness of this dissimilarity can be better realised when it is borne in mind that Anglicanism is not what it is in consequence of any check its growth received in primitive times. Its silence is not the silence of childhood, but a refusal to speak. It is no mere ignorance of the fulness of Catholic truth, but deliberate rejection of many of its important details, which has led to the negations that have here been briefly noted. The gravity of this distinction will be more clearly seen when we come to consider the Anglican form of ordination. Here it suffices to point out that heresy need not be explicit and expressed in order to be real heresy. Silence, under certain circumstances, may be sufficient to condemn. If the truth is proposed to one suspected of heresy, and he refuses to say *Credo*, he need not formulate his own heretical belief in order to secure his condemnation. Perhaps he hardly knows what his own belief is ; anyhow it may vary from day to day. It is enough that he will not say the words the Church puts into his mouth.

This has an obvious application to the origin of Anglicanism. The compilers of its formularies had in happier days been familiar with the whole Catholic system, as it may now be found enshrined in the ancient Sarum Offices. They were moreover bound, by the decrees of

General Councils, and of approved national and provincial Synods, to accept as of faith doctrines which they either ignored, perverted, or rejected. The Prayer-book, therefore, was compiled in the face of venerable traditions and solemn definitions, which were binding under pain of sin on all who wished to be accounted Catholics. The Canon of the Mass, the prayers for the intercession of the Saints, and a hundred every-day Catholic forms, such as *Ave Maria*, *Fidelium animæ*, and the like, had been continually on the lips of those who devised or accepted the new religion ; and it is clear that, by making a clean sweep of them all, they intended to destroy, as indeed they did, all belief and devotion connected with the Sacrifice of the altar, the intercession of the Saints, and the aid which the living can render to the faithful departed. Omission certainly need not mean prohibition ; and there is no doubt but that so long as the Royal Supremacy was accepted in place of the Pope's, individuals were mostly left free to believe and practise in private what they could not wholly forget ; but omission at least means discouragement and neglect ; and when articles of faith, or recognised witnesses to those articles, are omitted at a time when they are being called in question by heretics, the mere omission must be condemned as heresy too.

These considerations ought to suffice to show how untenable is that theory, which, following Tract XC., High Churchmen even to this day attempt to defend, and according to which the Prayer-book rejects "the sacrifices of Masses" but not the Sacrifice of the Mass,* the "invo-

* "Masses for the quick and dead are not an abuse, but a distinct ordinance of the Church, which can as easily be destroyed as the Church herself. . . . I do not see then how it can be denied that this Article calls the Sacrifice of the Mass itself, in all its private and solitary celebrations (to speak of no other),

cation of Saints" but not their intercession, "the Romish doctrine of Purgatory" but not prayers for the dead. If the Anglican Church of the sixteenth century really wished to make these distinctions, why did she reject the Canon of the Mass, the prayers addressed to God for the Saints' intercession, and the suffrages for the holy souls?

Fairly to interpret the language of the Articles, we must contrast the religious spirit which dominated in England at the time of their promulgation with that which had prevailed when the century began. And when the change is clearly understood and its sweeping character recognised, we see the absurdity of the fallacy that would liken primitive Anglicanism to primitive Catholicism, and draw a

that is in all its daily celebrations from year's end to year's end, *toto orbe terrarum*, a blasphemous fable."—"Via Media" (Reprint of Tract XC. with notes), ii. 316.

The true meaning of the Article is illustrated in these words from the "Homily concerning the Sacrament:"—"Take heed lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice. . . . Thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, *no sacrificing priest, no Mass*, no means established by man's invention."

If this be not enough to show that the Elizabethan Church of England officially rejected the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as it had been and is held in East and West, and not merely some corruption or superstition with which the true doctrine had become incrustured, the fact must surely be made clear to all men, not invincibly prejudiced, who will read in Burnet's "Reformation," vol. iv. p. 509, "A Declaration of certain principal Articles of Religion," enforced by all the Anglican Bishops on all their clergy, "for the unity of doctrine to be taught and holden." The Declaration in question was to be read by every newly-appointed incumbent when he entered upon his cure, "for the instruction of the people," and then afterwards twice every year, viz., at Easter and Michaelmas, immediately after the Gospel. The ninth Article of the Declaration was as follows:—"I do not only acknowledge that private Masses were never used amongst the Fathers of the primitive Church; . . . but also that the doctrine that maintaineth the Mass to be a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead, and a mean to deliver souls out of Purgatory, is neither agreeable to Christ's ordinance, nor grounded upon doctrine Apostolic; but contrarywise most ungodly and most injurious to the precious redemption of our Saviour Christ, and his only-sufficient Sacrifice offered once for ever upon the altar of the Cross." Such in Elizabeth's reign was the uniform teaching of that community which we are invited to believe was "a true Branch of the Catholic Church."

parallel between the Elizabethan system, when the people were whipped into the desecrated churches by the strong arm of the law, to hear "Morning Prayer" bungled through by some ignorant mechanic, who was made to do duty as parson until an educated "gospel minister" could be procured,—and the worship of the catacombs, where the faithful secretly met, in despite of the secular power, to adore and feed upon the Lamb of God, truly present in the Sacred Mysteries. Here, indeed, no likeness can be traced at all; but if it should be further attempted to compare the silence of the Church of England concerning great Catholic truths, with the reticence, or the few and broken utterances of the early Church, it would be only fair to reply that one might as reasonably say that the leafless but budding bough in Spring does not differ from that which some strong Summer gale has hurled to the ground, and which stray sheep have cropped. Perhaps to a superficial observer the likeness is strong; but the difference is really that between life and death. Yet what does the modern ceremonial movement do but pluck the leaves from off the living tree, and tie them to the withered branch, crying triumphantly, "It lives!" because indifference and political toleration are content to let them there remain.

Here then we quit our consideration of the *primâ facie* evidence. Taken by itself, probably no one would maintain that it is in favour of the modern High Church claim. Catholics would say that it is so far decisive against it that nothing but the most irrefragable testimony to the history and theology of the acts themselves, by which the succession is alleged to have been continued, can suffice to set aside the "urgency of visible facts."

III.

HISTORICAL AND THEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

§ 15. *The Question of Anglican Ordinations until the Death of Queen Mary.*

IT is not to be denied that from the purely historical standpoint the Anglican claim has greater apparent strength than our consideration of the *primâ facie* evidence would have led us to suppose possible. Indeed, only two links in the chain of succession have ever been called in question at all ; and the second of these, Parker's consecration, has of late years received additional strength by the discovery of fresh evidence. On the other hand, however, the researches of the late Mr. Haddan and of Canon Estcourt have brought out the suspicious character of the earlier link, Barlow's consecration ;* so that, though it

* The writer of an article on "The Anglican Form of Ordination" in the *Church Quarterly* for January, 1878, says: "The work of Canon Estcourt is an elaborate indictment of the validity of our form. Some of his co-religionists appear . . . to be far from easy as to the soundness of his reasoning, and prefer to cling to the imagination that Barlow was unconsecrated." Since Canon Estcourt devotes twenty pages to the discussion of Barlow's case, and concludes with the words, "With so many circumstances of suspicion, arising from different quarters, yet pointing the same way, it is impossible to admit the fact of his consecration without more direct proof of it,"—one can only suppose that the writer had not read what he nevertheless professed to review. Certainly he cannot have studied it. In striking contrast with this superficial treatment of a difficult question stands the calm and judicial language of the writer in the American *Catholic World* already referred to ; who, after a careful summing up of the historical aspect of the controversy, gives as his opinion that, even should the Anglican Ordinal be pronounced theologically sufficient, still, in view of the grave doubts which now encompass Barlow's Episcopal character, the Church could not permit Anglican clerical converts to act as priests without their first submitting to conditional ordination.

may be readily conceded that there has been an unbroken succession of persons called Bishops connecting the existing Anglican Hierarchy with the ancient Church, and that the historical objections do not *per se* constitute a disproof of Anglican Orders, yet it must be maintained that the actual succession of consecrations cannot be freed from all doubt ; and moreover, when another department of the evidence is examined, it will be found that the history of the claim advanced by Anglicans presents very serious difficulties to those who now assert that they are in possession of nothing less than the Catholic Priesthood.

It is, however, on theological grounds that the controversy has been chiefly conducted ; and it is here that the writer believes that Anglican Orders can be shown utterly untrustworthy, without any need of reference to other evidence. But, as the historical and theological questions are very closely connected, they will in these pages be treated together, with only such divisions of the subject-matter as are necessary to give clearness to the discussion. A full and systematic consideration of all the points at issue, together with a reproduction at length of the documents and authorities referred to, would be impossible within the limits of an ordinary Essay ; continual reference will therefore be made to Canon Estcourt's treatise for the benefit of those who desire to study the details of the controversy. We begin with a sketch of the period under discussion, before proceeding to a somewhat extended examination of the nature of the Anglican Priesthood.

The Reformation in England was no sudden event. Its seeds had been sown by Wicklyffe a hundred and fifty years before Henry VIII. came to the throne ; and, when the great struggle itself began, thirty years or so elapsed between the rejection of the Papal Supremacy and the

establishment of the Anglican system by the organisation of the Elizabethan Hierarchy in 1560. Even at this later date the mass of the people were still Catholic at heart; and Rome, ever slow to close the door while yet a hope of repentance may remain, refrained from any formal condemnation of the Queen's proceedings. Ten years elapsed before the Bull of excommunication was issued; and then those who remained true to the old faith saw that, if they cared for the salvation of their souls, they must withdraw themselves entirely from all connection with the new national religion. And so began that cruel persecution, which lasted for more than a hundred years, and in which some two hundred priests laid down their lives for the Catholic faith.*

So soon as the Church of England had in 1534

* The persecution endured by Catholics in England has hitherto been studiously ignored, if not denied, by the majority of English Protestants. But recent Histories of England, though written by Protestants, have been less reticent on the subject; and the partial breaking-up of old prejudices now permits non-Catholics to read such books as Bishop Challoner's touching "Memoirs of Missionary Priests," a work which has at least this advantage over Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," that it is thoroughly trustworthy. The Marian persecution has made a deep impression on the national mind, because its method was tragic, and its victims numerous for so short a period. Yet more Englishmen have suffered as Catholics than as Protestants, if we reckon up the whole list from the martyrdom of the Carthusian Priors in 1535 to that of Archbishop Plunket in 1681; and the mode of execution adopted in Elizabeth's reign was fully as brutal as that employed by Mary had been terrible. It was indeed "a disgusting and obscene butchery. . . . Commonly the hanging was little more than a rude shock. It was the knife and not the rope which was the real instrument of execution. The body was torn down alive from the gallows and then submitted to the barbarous and indescribable process by which it was ripped up, torn to pieces, and literally, bit by bit, thrown into the boiling caldron before the still open eyes of the dying martyr" ("Calendar of English Martyrs," p. 8). And this was not unfrequently the end of blameless and saintly men, after various tortures and protracted imprisonment, who suffered indeed as traitors, an unjust and odious charge, but whose sole crime was really their Priesthood, and sometimes simply their faith. See Preface to Jack's edition of Challoner (Edinburgh, 1878); Father Knox's Historical Introduction to the "Records of English Catholics under the Penal Laws" (London, 1878); Father Morris, S.J., "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers;" and the "Records of the English Province, S.J."

rejected the Pope's Supremacy, it lost, on Roman Catholic principles, its canonical *status* and jurisdiction, and contemporaneously heretical opinions began to germinate among its clergy ; while a certain number lapsed very far indeed from the ancient faith. No further change, however, of grave importance in the doctrine or ritual of the Church was definitively made during the reign of Henry, that is, for some thirteen years ; so that the consecrations and ordinations of this period were validly though unlawfully performed, inasmuch as the rubrics and language of the Pontifical would have hindered those Bishops who were lapsing from the faith from giving any decided expression to their heretical opinions.

The accession of Edward VI., in 1547, gave these men greater freedom of action ; and, though the Catholic rites were still legally binding, it appears that in certain cases the Bishops took upon themselves to omit such of the ceremonies as they deemed superstitious or superfluous.* Ordinations thus conferred would, on Catholic principles, need to be carefully scrutinised before their validity could be admitted. It might be found necessary, in various cases, to supply some unimportant adjuncts of the rite, or else to repeat the whole, either with or without a condition.

Late in the year 1549 (or early in 1550, as we should now reckon) appeared the first Reformed Ordinal, as a supplement to the Prayer-book now enforced by law. This book retained the Orders of Bishop, priest, and deacon ; but, beyond the term "priest," it employed no expression involving a sacerdotal view of the Christian Ministry. Sweeping as was the change thus effected, the Ordinal of 1549 departed less widely than any subsequent

* Only one Bishop, however, Ferrer of St. David's, was consecrated after the accession of Edward and before the publication of the Reformed Ordinal.

edition has done from the externals of the Catholic rite ; for in the ordination of priests it retained a sort of "tradition of the instruments" (but with an entirely new "form" taken from Lutheran sources, in place of the ancient one, which had taught the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrifice), and the candidates were directed to wear albs, and the Bishops copes.*

This earliest Anglican Ordinal, although essentially a new and Protestant formulary, did not, in consequence of such ceremonial as it retained, satisfy the Reforming party ; and so, after a few months, a new edition was put forth, omitting the rubrics as to dress, and reducing the whole "matter" of ordination to the imposition of hands,—unless, indeed, we are to regard as such the novel ceremony of the delivery of a Bible with some words of exhortation. It was this second edition of Edward's Ordinal which the Church of England used until 1662 ; it is therefore on its sufficiency that the validity of the existing Anglican Orders depends. Its details will be examined later. In its earlier or later form it was used for the consecration of six "Bishops" in Edward's reign, Cranmer, the apostate Archbishop of Canterbury, being in each case the officiant.

But the accession of Mary in 1553 puts a stop to these proceedings, and heralded the restoration of Catholicism. The only bearing that the events of her reign have on the question before us, concerns the attitude alleged to have been assumed by Cardinal Pole, the Papal Legate, towards those who had received Edwardine Orders. Anglican writers have continually asserted, and some have attempted to prove, that, acting under the authority of Pope

* It is noticeable that these two vestments are the only two which in the Catholic rites are given no significance by a form of investiture. Moreover, though the alb is now strictly a sacerdotal dress, yet both it and the cope had been commonly worn by lay assistants in the ancient worship.

Julius III., the Cardinal recognised, or perhaps rather ought to have recognised them as valid, and as needing only "rehabilitation," in order to be legitimately exercised. The assertion is important ; for Catholics have ordinarily pointed to what they believe to have been the uniform action of the Church towards the recipients of Anglican Orders, as moral evidence, practically amounting to proof, of their nullity. If, however, Edwardine Orders were in Mary's reign admitted to be even probably valid, it is obvious that the action of the Church has not been uniform or consistent in the matter ; and the argument founded upon it falls to the ground. We must therefore consider the allegation.

The Bulls, or Briefs (for they are variously described), enabling Pole to reconcile England to the Holy See, were evidently drawn up with great care.* There is one dated August 5, 1553, and another, March 8, 1554. If their language is closely examined, they will be found to specify various degrees of irregular ecclesiastical *status*, and in addition, an usurpation of Episcopal and clerical functions without consecration or ordination at all.† The Briefs

* They are given at length in Tierney's edition of Dodd's "Church History of England," vol. ii. Appendix xxii. Other documents relating to Pole's proceedings in England are given by Estcourt, Appendices xi.-xxi.

† The distinctions which follow in the text were first suggested, though somewhat less fully, by Tournely, the celebrated Doctor of the Sorbonne, who included a dissertation on Anglican Orders in his treatise on the Sacrament of Order (Quæst. ii. Art. ii.). The historical question he did not discuss ; but he decided against their validity on theological grounds. And his conclusion is the more noteworthy, inasmuch as he distinctly favoured certain theological positions in regard to the Sacrament of Order which Anglicans strenuously maintain. Thus, he held that the presence of three Bishops was absolutely necessary for a valid Episcopal consecration ; and, against Morin and Martène, he took the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* to be the actual form. His contention, however, against Anglican Orders is the same as that urged in this Essay—viz., that the form in question cannot be regarded as bearing in the Anglican rites the necessary orthodox sense.

As to the distinctions made in the Briefs of Pope Julius III., it may no doubt be objected that they do not appear on the surface, and that no clear

thus provided for the condition of all those ecclesiastics with whom the Cardinal, either directly or through his representatives, could, under any circumstances, be called upon to deal; though it did not necessarily follow that all the powers granted to him would be called into exercise; for he was not to absolve the heretics and usurpers indiscriminately, but to deal with them singly, as they made their submission, and abjured their former errors. There is no mistaking, however, the generous spirit in which these documents are framed.

First of all the Cardinal would meet with men described as *ritè et legitimè promoti et ordinati ante eorum lapsum in hæresim*. These words seem to point to those Bishops and priests who had been consecrated or ordained twenty

line is drawn between the clergy ordained with the Pontifical and the Edwardine Bishops and priests. But in reply it must be said that the Briefs employ the large phrases customary in legal documents, and were intended thus to leave Pole the utmost freedom of action when he should have arrived in England, and have obtained accurate information as to the state of affairs. Pope Julius can only be adduced as a witness on the Anglican side when it can be shown that he and the theologians who aided him in preparing the Briefs had before them full evidence of the nature of the Edwardine Ordinal, and deliberately selected the word *rehabilitare* in regard to those who had been ordained by its use, in the sense of supplying some non-essential adjuncts, or perhaps even of mere absolution. And Pole can only be adduced in evidence when it can be shown that he acted in accordance with such instructions. But neither of these things can be done; and it is unfair to twist the language of documents, worded with studious moderation in the charitable hope of winning back as many as possible of the heretical ministers to the unity of the Church, into an acknowledgment of the validity of Protestant Orders without any previous investigation of their theological value, and when there was absolutely no precedent for such a course. Probably the Pope and his advisers had no more than a general knowledge that for twenty years or so ecclesiastical irregularities of every kind had been rife in England; and he wished to aid Pole to the utmost in his arduous task of reducing this chaos to order; and with this end in view he gave him the fullest powers and made the widest possible concessions, in his use of which the Cardinal was to be guided by his own discretion. It must therefore be distinctly shown that Edwardine Bishops or priests were acknowledged in certain cases to be truly such by Pole or by his sub-delegates, or else nothing in favour of Anglican Orders can be made out of these Briefs.

years ago, before the schism in Henry's reign, and who needed only a lawful absolution to render their position regular.

Next we meet with the case of those *qui ordines vel munus consecrationis malè susceperunt,* ab aliis episcopis vel archiepiscopis, etiam hæreticis et schismaticis*. This description accurately applies to the majority of the priests and Bishops ordained or consecrated during the schism in Henry's reign. Of the validity of their Orders there could be little doubt; but their position was gravely irregular, and they would need a special dispensation before they could legitimately exercise their functions.

Thirdly, we can distinguish the case of ecclesiastics whose Orders had been conferred upon them *aliàs minus ritè, et non servatâ formâ Ecclesiæ consuetâ*; and these also it appears were capable of "rehabilitation," *etiamsi ordines et munus hujusmodi etiam circâ altaris ministerium temerè exsecuti sint*.

Now who were these men? The apologists of Anglican Orders not unnaturally take the words to describe the Edwardine Bishops and priests. But surely the expressions are rather applicable to the case of those who were ordained in the first two years of Edward's reign, and perhaps, in a few cases, in Henry's reign as well, not with the Anglican rites, but with the Pontifical, though not with all its ceremonies.†

* The construction of this sentence, but not its sense, has been slightly altered to suit the context.

† As the Reforming party had entirely abandoned the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice even before the death of King Henry, the ceremony of the "tradition of the instruments" would no doubt have been robbed by these men of its accompanying form, so soon as they found themselves free to mutilate the ancient rites; if indeed they did not omit that ceremony altogether. And it is not easy to see how in those days such an ordination could have been regarded as valid. If then they who interpret the 15th Article of Queen Mary's Injunctions (which directed that what was lacking in those persons who had

Moreover, there is also a fourth class, distinctly marked off from the above, which would have no occupants if the Edwardine clergy were placed in the third. The Briefs clearly specify the case of men with whom the Cardinal might have to deal, and whom he would find professing to exercise Orders *quos nunquam susceperunt*. Besides the *ritè et legitime promoti* he would meet with others *non promoti*; and these, *si digni et idonei reperti fuerint*, he was empowered to advance to Sacred Orders, and even to the Presbyterate. The Archbishops and Bishops unlawfully appointed by Henry and Edward are referred to as having obtained, not only the emoluments, but even the government of their respective Sees, *tanquam veri archiepiscopi aut episcopi*; and they are distinguished into two classes: those who had been consecrated, and needed only absolution; and those who had not been consecrated, whose defect the Cardinal was to supply, their reconciliation to the Church being assumed. That it was no mere question of laymen, admitted on all hands to be such, enjoying the fruits of ecclesiastical benefices (an abuse only too common in the days of the Church's temporal wealth), is clear from the illustration of the language of the Briefs furnished by contemporary documents. We read of "pretensed Bishops," and of "married laymen, who, *in pretence and under colour of priestly Orders*, had obtained parochial churches with cure of souls." *

The conclusion, then, seems to be inevitable, that the

been ordained "after the new sort and fashion" was to be "supplied"), are correct in referring this direction to the use of the ceremony of the tradition of the instruments, it would seem to follow that the word "supply" is there incorrectly used to include more than a non-essential adjunct to the rite. It would practically amount to re-ordination *sub conditione*; which indeed is also not an impossible interpretation of the word "rehabilitation."

* See Estcourt, pp. 28-59, and Canon Raynal's "Letter on the Validity of Anglican Orders," pp. 6-17.

recipients of Edwardine Orders form the fourth class of *nunquam ordinati*, to which the Briefs refer; in other words, that they were regarded simply as laymen in relation to the Catholic Ministry. Indeed, no serious case of their recognition has ever been adduced;* and Anglican writers, in order to confirm their interpretation of the language of the Briefs, can only protest that no formal investigation of the validity of Edward's rites was made, and that the diocesan registers record no case of re-ordination or of ordination *sub conditione*. But this is really evidence on the Catholic side. The living Church instinctively set aside as worthless, rites, which were what they were through deliberate rejection of her most sacred traditions; and she sanctions no such act as re-ordination. If any of the Edwardine ministers were reconciled to the Church, and found a vocation to the Priesthood, they would simply have been ordained *ab initio*; nor would any record of their previous condition have been entered in the register, any more than is the case now. That any such men, or indeed any of those who had consented to

* John Scory, an heretical priest, had been "consecrated" Bishop of Chichester with the Reformed Ordinal. On Mary's accession he was reconciled to the Church by Bonner, whose testimonial letter (given, though not at full length, in Mr. Bailey's "Defence of Anglican Orders," p. 47), speaks of Scory as "our beloved *confrater* John, lately Bishop of Chichester." Doubts have been thrown on the authenticity of the document; but it is nevertheless insisted on by Anglicans as a proof that Scory was "rehabilitated" not merely as priest but as Bishop. It may, however, be observed that the letter merely permits Scory to say Mass within Bonner's diocese of London. It is in fact a certificate that he had at that time put away his wife, and so was in a position to be restored to the exercise of his Priesthood. And Bonner in styling him "Bishop" need only have employed the term in good-humoured banter, to identify a man who was presumably penitent, and who for two years had been legally styled "Bishop of Chichester." Moreover, Bonner's faculties only enabled him to reconcile priests and not Bishops. He could, therefore, have done nothing for Scory until the latter had repudiated his Episcopal character. Scory's repentance was but temporary, for he soon returned to his errors, and he will come before us again as "one of Parker's consecrators."

receive ordination *minùs ritè, et non servatâ formâ Ecclesiæ consuetâ*, made their submission to the Papal Legate, and were admitted (perhaps in the latter case *sub conditione*) to canonical Orders, is hardly likely ; for they were in fact advanced Protestants, wholly out of sympathy with the Catholic system ; and for the most part they fled across the seas to avoid persecution, and formed what was called "the Church of England in exile," at Frankfort, Strasburg, Zurich, or Geneva.*

And, in the case of those men who sought no reconciliation with the Church, and who in the later years of Mary's brief reign were proceeded against for heresy, it is noticeable that Edwardine Orders were ignored in the process of degradation which preceded their execution. Thus, while Cranmer was solemnly degraded in St. Frideswide's Cathedral at Oxford from the Episcopate, and then from the Presbyterate and the other Orders, the degradation of Hooper of Gloucester, an Edwardine Bishop, began with the Presbyterate.

Against this argument, which indeed is only auxiliary to the main question, Anglicans have maintained that it proves too much, since, as they assert, Latimer, Ferrer, and Ridley, who had been consecrated Bishops according to the Pontifical, and had afterwards lapsed into Protestantism, were also not degraded from the Episcopate.

* It is fair to add that the interpretation put by Anglicans on the language of the Papal Bulls is natural and consistent from their own point of view ; save that it altogether fails to account for the *nunquam ordinati*. The rest they divide into two classes, the *ritè et legitimè promoti*, who are, as they think, all those ordained with the Pontifical, and the *malè et minùs ritè ordinati*, who should be the Edwardine clergy. But they forget that on Roman Catholic principles no one could have been *ritè et legitimè promotus* in England between 1534 and 1553 ; and that *minùs ritè ordinati* would have been regarded in the sixteenth century as an utterly inadequate expression to characterise the ecclesiastical *status* of men ordained by the Anglican rites. This will be seen more clearly when the theology of Catholic ordination is discussed.

So far as Latimer is concerned, the statement is incorrect. His Episcopal rank was recognised. Ferrer, as has been noted, had not been consecrated with the full rites of the Pontifical,* and so his Episcopal character was sufficiently doubtful to render unnecessary any notice of it in the ceremony of degradation. Concerning Ridley, the evidence is contradictory. Foxe alone states that his degradation began with the Presbyterate; and he makes the Catholic Bishop of Gloucester thus address him: "We take you for no Bishop, and therefore we will the sooner have done with you." If he really acted thus (and Foxe, it must be remembered, was a writer of romance rather than of history), it was in opposition to the commission he had received from Cardinal Pole, who distinctly refers to Ridley's "dignity of Bishop."

When, then, Queen Mary's reign is appealed to as witnessing to Catholic recognition of Edwardine Orders, it must be replied that on examination it will be found to furnish nothing that can safely be accounted such evidence, while the action of the Church, so far as it is known, was consistently on the other side.†

* See the account of his consecration in Estcourt, Appendix viii.

† It may be opportune to append a word on the sufferings of the Protestants in Mary's reign. Catholics may freely admit that in England (as also elsewhere) their treatment was severe to cruelty; that it was certainly inexpedient; and that such methods of dealing with heretics cannot reasonably be looked for in the future, and much less be desired. At the same time they must maintain that the use of force (and that chiefly by coöperation with the civil power) to repress false teaching—*e.g.*, by a censorship of the press, and ultimately by fine or imprisonment,—is not less defensible, in a Catholic country, than a similar use of force to repress immoral teaching, and is equally consonant with the mission of the Church to maintain truth as well as justice; and that, if ever unfaithfulness to the most solemn obligations deserved the punishment of death, Cranmer's was such a case; although his execution by burning was a piece of barbarism. The Marian persecution, though severe, was brief, and was carried out mainly by a few hard-hearted lay members of the Council, against the wishes of Cardinal Pole and other eminent ecclesiastics. It began in 1555 and ended in 1558, and between two and three hundred

persons in all were put to death. In only five dioceses, however, out of the whole number were there any executions; and these were chiefly in London, which was necessarily the focus for all strange opinions. Bonner has thus from his official position obtained an unenviable notoriety, though he seems to have been really a man of merciful disposition. Mary herself is recorded to have set at liberty all suspected heretics who were directly brought before her; and, at the time that the persecution was hottest, her health prevented her from taking any active part in public affairs. (See Maitland's "Reformation," Essay xx., and Mrs. Hope's "Franciscan Martyrs in England," pp. 75-80, where other references will be found.)

In any case the temper of the sixteenth century must not be judged by that of the nineteenth; and, moreover, the attempt to "stamp out" Protestantism is at least better capable of defence than the subsequent attempt to "stamp out" Catholicism, in so far as this, that all the ancient glories of England had been interwoven with near upon a thousand years' profession of the Catholic religion, and that the highest sanctions of justice and morality seemed to depend upon its maintenance; whereas everywhere Protestantism appeared to be leading to anarchy, and to be turning the world upside down. In the middle of the sixteenth century the term "Protestant" sounded as ill in the ears of loyal and conservative men, as the terms "Communist," "Socialist," and "Nihilist" do now. It ought to be unnecessary to add that the Papal Bulls authorising the punishment of heretics were disciplinary and not dogmatic, and that therefore no parts of them are involved in the recent definition of the Pope's infallibility.

§ 16. *The Establishment of the Elizabethan Hierarchy.*

Queen Mary and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Pole, died within a few hours of each other in 1558, and Elizabeth succeeded, professedly as a Catholic, being crowned with the full rites of the Pontifical, and sending to the Pope the customary announcement of her accession.* But her private sentiments were well known, and the Protestant refugees began to return in great numbers, and were received with welcome, and even with distinction; Dr. Cox, who had been the leader of the moderate party at Frankfort, and the opponent of Knox, being selected to preach at the High Mass with which her first Parliament was opened. This singular event was typical of the attempted fusion of Catholics and Protestants into one national religion, which was the dream of Elizabeth and her advisers, and which was indeed up to a certain point successful, though it was eventually effected on a considerably lower platform than that of this inaugural act. The religion of the Queen, so far as

* These facts have an important bearing on the sentence of excommunication and deposition pronounced by St. Pius V., twelve years after Elizabeth's accession, in the Bull *Regnans in excelsis*. Whatever rights the national will conferred upon Elizabeth as Queen, the Pope could not of course take from her. But he could and did deprive her of that "divine right" which the ceremony of coronation was commonly thought to confer, or at least to confirm. Among the reasons for her condemnation are the following:—"Catholicæ fidei cultores oppressit; improbos concionatores atque impietatum administros reposuit; missæ sacrificium, preces, jejunia, ciborum delectum, coelibatum, ritusque catholicos abolevit; libros manifestam hæresim continentes toto regno proponi, impia mysteria ad Calvinii præscriptum à se suscepta et observata etiam à subditis servari mandavit; . . . catholicos antistites et ecclesiarum rectores in vincula conjecit, ubi multi diuturno languore et tristitiâ confecti extremum vitæ diem miserè finierunt." It will be observed that the Pope here incidentally condemns the whole Anglican system, Prayer-book, Orders and all. The document is given at length in Tierney's edition of Dodd's "Church History of England," vol. iii. Appendix ii.

she had any at all, was a modified Catholicism, without the Mass, and with herself for Pope ; she seems never to have been able quite to conquer her secret admiration for the old faith, and at times she could not restrain her contempt for the Bishops of her own making. Sensitive, however, to the Papal condemnation of her illegitimate birth, she would not tolerate the notion of any authority other than her own within her realm, though its province might be distinct from hers, and would have proved auxiliary rather than hostile to it. Her first step therefore was to cut the Church adrift from the safe anchorage of Rome ; and consequently the anti-Catholic party gained the day, and Anglicanism was established on a distinctly Protestant basis.

Whatever may be said as to the participation of the English Church in the Reformation during the reigns of Henry and Edward, it is certain that the formation of the Elizabethan system was in no sense the act of the Church of England as it existed legally and canonically in 1558.* Convocation had nothing whatever to do with the reproduction in a slightly modified form of Edward's second

* The Protestant defenders of the Anglican system commonly maintain that the Church of England of Queen Mary's reign was an usurpation and a schism ; solely, it would seem, because it dispossessed Protestantism, and was in full communion with Rome. On what other grounds its *status* can be challenged it is difficult to see. Every authority, civil as well as ecclesiastical, that had any right to a voice in the matter, aided in the restoration of Catholicism, or at least recognised it when restored. The Queen and the Houses of Parliament, as well as those of Convocation, all adhered to the re-establishment of the old religion ; and (it may be worth noting) the Sarum rites and not the Roman were those in use throughout Mary's reign. That Low Churchmen should reject as schismatical the Catholic Church of England as it existed from 1553 to 1558, and should reverently trace the descent of the Elizabethan Church from the Edwardine, *viâ* Frankfort and Geneva, is natural and consistent ; but High Churchmen can only do so as a controversial expedient, and to avoid facing the stern fact that between the Catholic Hierarchy of 1557 and the Protestant Hierarchy of 1567 there was absolutely no continuity whatever.

Prayer-book. Neither they nor the Bishops were consulted in the matter. The revision was prepared by a select and secret committee of eight or nine persons appointed by the Crown, none of them being Catholics, and not all even ecclesiastics. When the Book was before Parliament, Convocation drew up in opposition to it and unanimously signed a solemn declaration of their adherence to the Catholic faith, which was accepted by the Bishops, and laid before the Government, but only to be ignored.* In the House of Lords all the Bishops, together with the Abbot of Westminster, voted against the Act of Uniformity by which the new liturgical system was enforced, and which was eventually carried only by the narrow majority of three. If then continuity of faith and jurisdiction have anything to do with the continuity of the life of a national Church (and on Catholic principles they have everything to do with it), it is difficult to

* These Articles were afterwards signed by the authorities in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Their witness therefore to the faith of the old English Catholic Church is of grave importance. They have moreover a pathetic interest as being the last act of the true Provincial Synod of Canterbury; and a study of them must convince any one that it differed *toto calo* from that boneless body which now bears its name. The first four were as follows:—"We believe and confess—

1. "That in the Sacrament of the Altar, by virtue of the word of Christ being duly pronounced by the priest, there is present really under the species of bread and wine the natural Body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also His natural Blood.

2. "Also, that after consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance, save the Substance of God and Man.

3. "Also, that in the Mass is offered the true Body of Christ, and His true Blood, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead.

4. "Also, that to Peter the Apostle and his lawful successors in the Apostolic See, as being the Vicars of Christ, has been given the supreme power of feeding and governing the Church of Christ militant, and of confirming their brethren."

It will be observed that this last Article witnesses to the doctrines of the Papal supremacy and infallibility which the Vatican Council defined. The original Latin of the whole document will be found in Dodd, vol. ii. Appendix xxxix.

see how (the question of Orders apart) the Elizabethan Church represented the ancient English Church, except so far as the corpse represents the living man.* But we must proceed now to notice the events through which the Episcopal succession is alleged to have been retained.

At the date of Elizabeth's accession ten of the English Sees—Canterbury, Salisbury, Oxford, Chichester, Hereford, Rochester, Norwich, Gloucester, Bristol, and Bangor—were vacant by death; and in the following year sixteen others—York, London, Winchester, Durham, Ely, Worcester, Lincoln, Bath and Wells, Lichfield, Exeter, Peterborough, Carlisle, Chester, St. David's, St. Asaph, and Man—found themselves arbitrarily bereft of their last Catholic occupants by the process of Parliamentary deprivation, on account of refusal to take the oath of the Queen's supremacy. In Catholic eyes, of course, these Sees were not really vacated, any more than those are in Germany in our own day, whose Bishops are "deposed" by the Falk laws. The legitimate Hierarchy ceased to exist only when Watson, Bishop of Lincoln, died at Wisbeach in 1584, after having been a prisoner for his faith during five-and-twenty years, and Goldwell, Bishop of St. Asaph, died in Rome in 1585.

But, though ready to be thus unscrupulous in setting aside the ancient Catholic Hierarchy, Elizabeth and her Council were by no means disposed to get rid of Bishops altogether; though we shall later find reason to believe that they cared nothing for that sacred character which alone gives substantial reality to the office and work of a Bishop. Episcopal *authority*, however, had by the tradition of a thousand years, acquired in England a weight and prestige, such as an astute ruler would have held it

* See in the Appendix, Note VII., on "The Continuity of the Church of England."

folly to destroy, when there was a prospect of making them subservient to the supremacy of the Crown. Should Elizabeth succeed in imposing on the country an Episcopate acknowledging its entire dependence on her, while at the same time the mass of the people could be persuaded that these men were real Bishops, with a lawful claim on their obedience, the national Church would be *ipso facto* established as the ecclesiastical department of the State.

It is difficult to find any other motive save this of political expedience for the anxiety which those in high places certainly displayed to secure an apparently legitimate transmission of Episcopal authority to a Protestant Hierarchy ; for that they cared a straw for those spiritual gifts, which Catholics believe true Bishops are empowered to dispense, cannot be maintained in the face of historical facts.

And the difficulties they had to encounter were certainly serious. The Metropolitan See of Canterbury was the important one to fill, for on the shoulders of the Primate would lie the main burden of establishing the new system throughout the country. Dr. Matthew Parker, who had been confessor to the Queen's mother and Dean of Lincoln, a priest who had accepted the Reformed doctrines and married, was selected for the post ; but he shrank from the tremendous responsibilities it involved, and for nearly six months firmly resisted the entreaties of the Council and even the commands of the Queen. At length, however, he yielded ; and then the next difficulty was to secure the performance of some ceremony that should pass for consecration. The difficulty was twofold, to find men to act, and to find a rite that they should use. The Prayer-book and Ordinal put forth under Edward had been legally abolished in Mary's reign ; and though Elizabeth's Act of

Uniformity had restored the revised Prayer-book, it had made no provision for an Ordinal, for that was still a separate book. Certainly the rites in the Pontifical had prescription in their favour; but they could not be employed to make such Bishops as the Protestants would accept; and in the end this difficulty of obtaining a rite that should be at once legal and appropriate remained unsolved.

But it was more important to find men to act. There were, no doubt, two or three returned refugees, who had been known as Bishops in Edward's reign, and who were ready to do anything that the Queen desired; but they occupied as yet no recognised position in the country; and it was not clear how they could impart to others an authority which they did not themselves possess. Before therefore the deprivation of the Catholic Bishops was complete, the Queen issued a commission to several of them, Tonstall, of Durham, Bourne, of Bath and Wells, Pole, of Peterborough, and Kitchen, of Llandaff, bidding them perform the consecration of Parker. Barlow and Scory, two of the men who, whether Bishops or no, had certainly acted as such in Edward's reign, and who had lately returned from abroad, were united with the Catholic Bishops in this Royal commission. The mandate however proved fruitless, as indeed was inevitable. As Canon Estcourt remarks, "It is difficult now to understand how any one could expect that a commission would be executed, which bore so gross an insult on the face of it. Not merely to require them to consecrate a married priest, notoriously suspected of heresy, but to join with them two suspended excommunicated ecclesiastics and apostate Religious, was sufficient of itself to prevent the execution of the mandate."* It is perhaps a tenable hypothesis that the docu-

* Estcourt, p. 85.

ment was merely an attempt to "rehabilitate" Barlow and Scory by officially connecting them with acknowledged Bishops.

This first commission having failed, and all the Sees being now legally vacant, save that of Llandaff, whose Bishop, Kitchen, a weak and aged man, is said to have taken the oath of the Queen's Supremacy;* he received a second Royal mandate, bidding him unite with all the available men in the kingdom who had any claim to Episcopal character (six in all were mentioned), in confirming and consecrating the Archbishop-elect. Kitchen, however, and two others who were named, contrived to be excused; and eventually the consecration, such as it was, fell to the lot of four men, Barlow, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale, whose power to consecrate validly will be considered later, when we have estimated the value of the unauthorised rite they used. We learn from *ex parte* accounts, somewhat inconsistent and grotesque withal, that these four, in the presence of a few friendly witnesses, laid their hands on Parker in the private chapel of Lambeth Palace (he had already for some time been in possession of the temporalities of the See) early in the morning of the 17th of December, 1559, the same men having eight days previously confirmed his election at Bow Church by the bare Royal authority. They are said to have employed the second edition of Edward's Ordinal; and the actual consecration would thus have consisted in the imposition of hands, with the words, "Take the Holy Ghost," some Scriptural exhortation following, together with the delivery of a Bible.

Three days after this event Parker confirmed Barlow and Scory in the Sees of Chichester and Hereford respec-

* Doubt has recently been thrown on the assertion that he apostatised. See Estcourt, p. 93. He died in 1563.

tively; and they then proceeded, by the use of the Protestant Ordinal, to fill up the thrones that were either vacant or had been violently deprived of their occupants. Some twenty Bishops were consecrated within the space of eighteen months, and thus the Anglican Hierarchy was established.*

The Queen and her advisers could not but be aware that grave doubts would arise in the minds of many as to the validity of such proceedings as these. They had foreseen the difficulty, and had provided against it in their own way and to their own satisfaction. The great Anglican dogma of the Royal Supremacy, the rock on which the new Church was built, and on which (to change the metaphor), it bids fair soon to go to pieces, supplied them with a ready means to make good all possible defects. And so, in the Royal Commission by virtue of which Barlow and the others consecrated Parker, these words occur: "Supplying nevertheless by our supreme Royal authority, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, if anything, either in those things which shall be done by you, according to our aforesaid mandate, or in you, or any one of you, is or shall be wanting, in condition, state, or faculty, of those things which are required or are necessary by the statutes of this kingdom, or by the ecclesiastical laws in this matter, the nature of the time and the necessity of the circumstances requiring it."†

* Not all the Sees were so quickly provided for. York and its suffragan Sees had no Protestant Bishops for nearly two years after the deprivation of the Catholics. Gloucester and Bristol were vacant for three years and a half, and were then united; and Oxford lacked a Bishop for ten years.

† "Supplentes nihilominus supremâ auctoritate nostrâ regiâ, ex mero motu et certâ scientiâ nostris si quid aut in his quæ juxtâ mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis aut vestrum aliquo conditione statu facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum quæ per statuta hujus nostri regni aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante."

It should be observed that the expressions here used by the Queen, *ex mero motu et certâ scientiâ nostris*, are copied from Papal documents.

This singular clause has often been thought to have had especial reference to the case of Barlow (which will be referred to at length later), and to be a practical admission that he was no true Bishop. But it is perhaps better to take it as an attempt to cover all the extreme irregularities which the consecration involved, Barlow's very considerable share in those irregularities being of course included. It was the legal rather than the spiritual validity of the act which the dispensation was designed to secure.*

But, in spite of this gracious grant of special faculties on the part of Elizabeth, there were still to be found persons captious and perverse enough to question the *status* of the Queen's Bishops; and to meet their objections, or rather to silence them, an Act of Parliament was passed in 1565, at the request of Archbishop Parker himself, providing, among other things, "that all acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons in or about any consecration, confirmation or investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesty's dominions or countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's letters patents or commissions, since the beginning of her reign, be and

* Similarly, some have taken the words *facultas*, *conditio*, and *status*, to refer to jurisdiction, legal position, and Episcopal character respectively. But the late Mr. Hope-Scott, Q.C., expressed his opinion thus: "I am not disposed to seek for separate and distinct meanings in the words. . . . The object of the civilians who advised [the Queen] was evidently to include in her dispensation, by the largest possible words, all the difficulties that might arise. . . . I think there can be no question but that even the want of consecration in the consecrators would in those times have been held cured by the language of the commission." Estcourt, p. 90.

shall be by authority of this present Parliament declared judged and deemed at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof good and perfect to all respects and purposes, any matter or thing that can or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding. And that all persons that have been or shall be made ordered or consecrated Archbishops, Bishops, priests, ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, or deacons, after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form, [that of Edward VI.], how Archbishops, Bishops, priests, deacons and ministers should be consecrated made and ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof declared and enacted to be, and shall be, Archbishops, Bishops, priests, ministers and deacons, and rightly made ordained and consecrated, any statute, law, canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding." *

* The earlier part of this Act (which is given at length by Dodd, vol. ii. Appendix xliii.), is almost amusing in the simplicity of its Erastianism. It begins by casting a slur on those who doubted the legitimacy of the Anglican Hierarchy, and complains that "divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech and talk have lately grown amongst many of the *common sort of people, being unlearned*, upon the making and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this realm." After a desperate effort to prove that Edward's Ordinal formed part of his Prayer-book (which it did not), and a reference to Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, the document proceeds, "Whereupon our Sovereign Lady, the Queen's most excellent Majesty, . . . hath by her supreme authority . . . caused sundry grave and well-learned men to be duly elected made and consecrated Archbishops and Bishops. . . . And further, for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questionings . . . her Highness, in her letters patent under the great seal of England . . . hath not only used such words and sentences as were accustomed to be used by the late kings Henry and Edward, . . . but also hath used . . . other general words and sentences, whereby her Highness, by her supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability that can or may in any wise be objected against the same . . . So that to all those that will well consider of the effect . . . of the supreme and absolute authority of the Queen's Highness, which she, by her letters patent, hath used . . . in and about the making and consecrating of the said Archbishops and Bishops, it is . . . very evident and apparent that no cause of scruple

These two documents betray some considerable uneasiness on the part of those in high places with regard to the legitimacy of the new Hierarchy ; and it will already have been observed that there were plenty of good reasons for such uneasiness. It is characteristic of the times which saw the birth of Anglicanism, that Royal mandates and Acts of Parliament should have been thought sufficient to make good, even retrospectively, whatever was wanting.

Probably, however, the modern Ritualist would not care to defend the legality of the acts by which the Elizabethan Hierarchy was constituted. It is impossible that he should have any serious sympathy with that portentous "Public Worship Regulation Act" which goes by the name of the "Act of Uniformity," or with the proceedings which followed upon its enforcement. His contention is that, if Elizabeth employed true Bishops to consecrate Parker, and they used a rite of sufficient validity in itself, the grace of Orders, with all its mysterious powers, was bequeathed to the Anglican Church, even though it be true that they who took part in the proceedings neither desired nor contemplated such a result. It will be then our business to show that the spiritual validity of their act was fully as open to question as was its legal regularity.

And there will be some advantage if we here anticipate a little, and append to the sketch above given, of the period under discussion, a sketch of the theological argument which points to the nullity of Anglican Orders in relation to the Catholic Priesthood.

Briefly then the position is this :—The powers of the Christian Ministry may be roughly divided into two dis-

ambiguity or doubt can justly be objected against the said elections, confirmations or consecrations." In the above extract the omissions are merely redundancies which do not affect the sense.

tinct departments, which we will term sacerdotal and pastoral respectively.* In the former we include the main function of the Priesthood, the power of offering Sacrifice, and generally the power of dispensing grace *ex opere operato*, e.g. by consecration, absolution, benediction, &c. ; or, in the case of Bishops, by confirmation, ordination, and the like. In the latter department we place the powers which have to do with ecclesiastical government ; and to these we may add preaching and spiritual direction. Moreover, the Sacraments also, if the Protestant estimate of them be accepted (*i.e.*, if they are regarded as external acts, which the minister indeed is duly authorised to perform, but to which the worthy recipient gives all the virtue they possess), come into this latter category, though properly they belong to the former.

Now in this Essay it will be maintained that, with regard to the sacerdotal powers of the Christian Ministry, the Anglican system was intended to be, and is, wholly in accordance with other Protestant systems ; that is to say, that these powers were totally rejected by the English as well as by the foreign Reformers. But at the same time it will be fully allowed that in regard to one of the pastoral powers of the Ministry, *i.e.*, in the matter of Episcopal government, the Church of England left the company of most other Protestant communities, and designedly

* This distinction is by theologians commonly expressed thus : 1. *Ordo, quatenus est Sacramentum.* 2. *Ordo, quatenus est Hierarchia.* Spiritual power and spiritual authority are the two ideas which correspond to the two departments into which the functions of the Christian Ministry are divided. And the distinction between the Catholic and Anglican notions of the Priesthood, which is developed in the following pages, is indicated by the words used as supplemental forms in the respective ordination rites of the Catholic and Anglican Churches. In the Pontifical we find "*Accipe potestatem,*" &c., and in the Prayer-book "*Take thou authority,*" &c. To his Apostles our Lord gave "*power and authority.*" (Luke ix. 1.)

adopted, at least nominally, a portion of the Catholic system, and was indeed specially anxious to retain it.

But it will also be urged that the sacerdotal powers of the Ministry are its substance, and that the pastoral powers have no legitimate basis apart from them ; and that if therefore the Church of England devised an Ordinal, which was of set purpose insufficient to transmit the former ; although it might profess to transmit the latter, it could do so only in name.

And our contention will be that such was really the case, and that the Anglican ordination rites are not, and were never meant to be, sacramental means of imparting spiritual and sacerdotal power *ex opere operato* ; but were meant to be, and are no more than, a solemn invocation of the divine blessing on a mere grant of external authority, to which no doubt may be appended, according to the state and dispositions of the recipient, an increase of sanctifying grace *ex opere operantis*, and upon which various *grâces d'état* may follow, if God so will, as occasion may arise. These last, no doubt, are all included in the idea of Catholic ordination, but they do not constitute its substance, which lies in the sacramental bestowal, *ex opere operato*, of spiritual *character* ; and it is just this which Anglican ordination appears to lack, if not to exclude.* And if this be so, Anglican Orders are not valid in the Catholic sense.

* That ordination which does not bestow *character* is not valid ordination, is clear from the language of St. Thomas, who says that *character* is *effectus Ordinis principalis*. (Supplem., qu. 34, a. 2.) The following propositions summarise the teaching of Catholic theologians on the nature and effect of the *character* conferred by the Sacrament of Holy Order. It will be seen at once that the ordinary Anglican view of ordination has very little in common with their doctrine :—

“Character est signum quoddam spirituale indelebile, per Sacramentum animæ impressum, habens rationem potentiae spiritualis, quæ potestatis, dignitatis et sacerdotii Christi participatio quædam est.”

Moreover, if we are correct in thus estimating the middle position which the Anglican Church undoubtedly took up in the sixteenth century, we can reconcile the nominal and superficial accordance of the Anglican Ministry and the Catholic, with the fact that that Ministry is nevertheless essentially Protestant ; and so, while condemning as erroneous the High Church theory of the Anglican system, we can readily admit its plausibility. Thus the High Churchman may argue, " Sacerdotalism is the legitimate outcome of Episcopacy ; all confess that the Church of England is Episcopal ; *ergo*, &c." But the answer is, There is Episcopacy and Episcopacy. That which is genuine is *Summum Sacerdotium*. Is this that of the Church of England ? And the course of this Essay will reply, No. In the Anglican system Episcopacy is merely a matter of Church government. Until quite recently the Church of England had no controversy with other Protestant Churches about the substance of the Christian Ministry, but only about the subordination of some ministers to others. Its Episcopacy therefore is merely nominal ; it has really nothing in common with Catholic Episcopacy ; and sacerdotalism, so far from being its legitimate outcome, is an alien incrustation upon it.

"Charactere Ordinis homo Christo Pontifici configuratur, utpote sacerdotalis dignitatis ac potestatis Christi particeps effectus. Characteri annexa est sublimis sacerdotis potestas in corpus Christi reale et mysticum."

See Schouppe's "Elementa Dogmatica," Tract. X., §§ 4, 16, 179-190, and Tract. XVI., § 88.

§ 17. *Uniformity of the Attitude of the Catholic Church towards the Recipients of Anglican Orders.*

It will be convenient at this point in our discussion, and before proceeding to a detailed consideration of the theological evidence against the sufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal, to complete our review of the attitude of the Catholic Church towards those who have received Anglican Orders, and to inquire whether since the accession of Elizabeth she has ever recognised as true Bishops and priests, or as even probably such, those whose spiritual descent is to be traced, if at all, through Barlow and Parker. Has the Church ever permitted to say Mass without her own ordination, or has she ever hesitated to ordain, save under condition, clerical converts from the Church of England to her own fold ?

Catholics may freely admit that what they believe to have been the uniform action of the Church in this matter constitutes with them a distinct prejudice against the tenability of the Anglican claim. But it does not follow that this prejudice ought to be regarded as culpable. Rather it is the inevitable outcome of their loyalty to their spiritual Mother ; and they would embrace her decision with equal readiness should it ever be formally made on the other side. They see, moreover, and gladly recognise, in the efforts some recent defenders of the Anglican claim have made to find that, at least in rare instances, the Church has judged favourably of Anglican ordinations, an admission of the paramount importance of the Church's decision ; and so, confessing the weight they attach to what they are convinced has been a continuous tradition, they are bound to acknowledge that the proving of even a single case that runs counter to it would considerably

embarrass this practically conclusive argument. Already we have seen that the assertion that there were such cases in the reign of Mary is unsupported by evidence; and Canon Estcourt has shown in detail that the attempts made to question the uniformity of the Church's action since the accession of Elizabeth have equally failed.*

During the reign of Elizabeth a fair number of Anglican clergymen were reconciled to the Catholic Church, and of these at least twelve are known to have received Catholic Orders, no account being made of their previous Anglican ordination. From among them Cuthbert Maine, Edmund Campion, Richard Sympson, John Lowe, John Adams, Everard Hanse, and Stephen Rousham were afterwards martyrs for the faith. Clerical conversions there have been since then continuously, though at certain periods they have been rare. At least two Bishops in Anglican Orders have been received into the Church as laymen (Dr. Gordon, of Glasgow, in 1703, and Dr. Ives, of North Carolina, in 1844);† and during the last forty years it is said that the converts from the Anglican clergy have numbered near upon four hundred.‡ Many of these of course have been married, or have otherwise found no vocation to the Priesthood, so that the question of their Orders never called for consideration; but in no

* "Anglican Ordinations," pp. 141-146 and 168.

† Other Anglican prelates, of whose reconciliation with the Church in the hour of death there have been vague rumours, but no real evidence, are Cheney, of Gloucester, in Elizabeth's reign, King, of London, Montagu, of Bath and Wells, and Goodman, of Gloucester, under James I. and Charles I. respectively (see Green's "History of the English People," p. 496); and Butler, of Durham (the author of the "Analogy"), in 1752 (see "Present Position of Catholics in England," p. 47).

‡ Some lists published by a London newspaper in the autumn of 1878, and confessedly incomplete, gave the names of more than three hundred Anglican clergymen who had been reconciled to the Church since 1840.

single instance has one who offered himself for the ecclesiastical state been even ordained conditionally. They have without exception been treated as laymen.

The presumption therefore in favour of the uniformity of the Catholic tradition as to the nullity of Anglican Orders appears to be strong; for every Catholic Bishop knows that he would at least commit material sacrilege if he attempted to re-ordain a man who was already a priest; and Catholic Bishops are of all men the least likely to be ignorant of any opinion favourable to the reality of the Anglican Priesthood expressed by Pope, Council, or one of their own brethren.* Nor is the uniformity of this tradition really broken if instances can be adduced of Catholics who, as private individuals, held the contrary opinion. Their peculiar view in favour of the Anglican claim does nothing to weaken the witness of the Church, unless it can be shown that they have been permitted to act upon it by some Bishop or other high ecclesiastical authority. The private opinion of this or that person, expressed perhaps before he has had time to familiarise himself with the spirit of the Church, or while he is in other respects loose in his adhesion to her, can carry very little weight. The value of his opinion depends on the fulness and

* It is in France, and in the seventeenth century, that Catholic Bishops are alleged in one or two instances to have recognised Anglican Orders. It is therefore worth noting that early in the eighteenth century the French Bishops appear to have been ignorant of such cases. Thus, in 1727, Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, in censuring Courayer's books said, "A Catholic theologian ought to speak with more respect of *the practice of the Church*, to propose to her with modesty his doubts and reflections, to await her decision with a submissive disposition, and not to prescribe laws to her in a presumptuous manner, nor to call ignorance and prejudice whatever is contrary to his opinion." And the other French Bishops bore the same testimony:—"He is not ashamed to put forth, and that with unbecoming self-assertion, opinions on the question of English ordinations *which he admits are opposed to the practice of the Roman Church.*" See Estcourt, Appendices xxix. and xxx.

accuracy of his information, and on his capability of forming a sound judgment. His peculiar view may prove to be a mere crotchet, the result of engrained prejudice; and Catholics are perhaps not unnaturally disposed to look on the holder of it with suspicion; for in one or two well-known instances, which will be noted later, active support to the Anglican theory has been the prelude to or the result of a lapse into schism and heresy.* De Dominis, Courayer, and the "Old Catholics" are those whom we have now in view.

And if it be urged that certain eminent Catholic laymen, as well as Dr. Lingard, have distinguished between the Anglican and other Protestant Churches on the ground that it has "retained the ancient Hierarchy," it is worth while to observe that we need proof that they meant more than a merely nominal retention. As laymen, it did not come into their province to examine the theological evidence; and they nowhere assert that the Church of England has retained sacramental Orders and a sacrificing Priesthood. The historical evidence is what they refer to; and Dr. Lingard did no more than admit, with characteristic fairness, that Catholics had up to that time questioned the actual historical succession on insufficient evidence. He allowed the *fact* of Parker's consecration; and with regard to Barlow, he acknowledged that his *status* not being questioned during his lifetime was so strongly in his favour as to leave no serious doubt of his having been regularly consecrated; but since Dr. Lingard's death fresh evidence adverse to Barlow has been brought to light.†

* So far as the writer has been able to ascertain, not a single Catholic Bishop or theologian at the present day regards Anglican Orders as even probably valid, though not a few have looked into the controversy.

† Dr. Lingard has himself explained in what sense he defended Anglican Orders in two letters to the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine*, for August and

Thus much then may be said as to the relevance of the private opinions of individual Catholics in favour of the Anglican claim, where such can be found. Whatever be the true interpretation of their words, they do not break the uniformity of the Church's witness.

But the allegation is more important where the action of Catholic authorities is implicated, by the assertion that they allowed this peculiar view to be followed in practice. This is what Dr. Lee has attempted to maintain ; but with poor success ; for out of the twelve clerical converts whom he adduced as declining to receive Catholic ordination, on the ground that they believed themselves to be priests already, Canon Estcourt has pointed out that, at the utmost, only five can be shown to have seriously raised the question of their Orders at all ; while out of these, in only two cases is it even questionable whether their private opinion was met by any action on the part of Catholic Bishops that could be accounted favourable to it. The circumstances in either case were these :—

Sir Harry Trelawney no doubt believed in his Anglican Orders after his conversion ; but towards the close of his life he was ordained deacon by Cardinal Odescalchi, who seems to have told him he was at liberty to consider the

November, 1834. The former letter he concludes as follows :—"Your readers will perceive that in this communication I have confined myself to the fact of Parker's consecration : whether it was valid or invalid according to Catholic doctrine is a theological question, with which as a mere writer of history I had no concern." He reiterates this in the second letter :—"I contend not for the validity, but only for the fact of his consecration." And then, denying that the Catholic repudiation of Anglican Orders was originally based on a rejection of the fact of Parker's consecration, he says :—"The old Catholic controversialists contended that the Protestant ordinations were invalid and illegal : invalid because they were performed with the insufficient form of Edward VI. ; illegal because that form had not been established by Act of Parliament, and because prelates who had never received a valid consecration, or having received such had been deposed, were not *lawfully* qualified for the office of consecrators."

ordination conditional, if he pleased ; though he himself neither expressed nor implied any condition.

Dr. Goffe appears to have raised the question of his Orders after his reconciliation to the Church ; but the assertion that the Archbishop of Paris permitted him to act as priest without Catholic ordination depends on mere rumour, and on no real evidence ; while on the other hand Father Davenport, commonly called Franciscus à Sancta Clara, whose attempt to pass the most favourable possible judgment on Anglicanism is well known, says of him plainly that "he was re-ordained, as all others have been." *

It seems then to come to this, that though strenuous efforts have been made to convict the Church of inconsistency in her practical dealings towards those who have received Anglican Orders, she can in no single instance be proved to have acted as if there were so much as a possibility of their validity ; and so the uniformity of her witness against them admits of no serious question.

* There are similar inaccuracies in Dr. Lee's allegation of other Catholic testimonies. Thus, Bishop Milner is adduced as a believer in Anglican Orders. But in the passage quoted he is giving, not his own judgment, but what the Church of England appeared to him to profess. His own opinion will be found in his "End of Controversy" (Chap. xxix.), where he says he thinks such Orders to be "at the least exceedingly doubtful."

§ 18. *Alleged Recognition of Anglican Orders by the Council of Trent, and by Popes Pius IV. and Innocent XII.*

Under these circumstances it is somewhat startling to find Anglican writers asserting as "undoubted facts" that the Council of Trent could only accuse Elizabethan Orders of irregularity, and even expressly refused to declare the Anglican Bishops illegitimate when requested by the Pope to do so. Moreover, when it is added that Pius IV. expressed his readiness to recognise the validity of English Orders, and that Innocent XII. was on the same side, one naturally demands some tolerably conclusive proof before accepting statements in themselves antecedently so improbable. And when it is found that this cannot be produced, and that the assertions have no serious foundation whatever, they carry no weight, save it be to condemn those who make them. But the fact that they have been made, and are from time to time repeated as unquestionable, necessitates their being examined, and their falsehood manifested.

First then as to the Council of Trent. On two distinct occasions it is said to have borne witness to the validity of Anglican Orders, so far at least as the Episcopate is concerned. For one of these testimonies the late Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, appears to be responsible.* He attached no little weight to what he thought was a recognition of the Anglican claim on the part of the Council; but, as will be seen, the only evidence he was able to produce is to the last degree precarious. The facts, as recorded by Le Plat, are these:—

In November, 1562, the question of jurisdiction was

* "Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 718.

under discussion, two opinions being maintained by various speakers. The one (which was ascribed to Gerson and Henry of Ghent) made jurisdiction to be received in each case directly from God, and to be dependent on the Pope only in regard to its lawful exercise ; while the other (which was said to be the opinion of St. Thomas, Cajetan, and others) regarded it as coming immediately from the Pope. The temper of the Council was strongly in favour of the latter opinion ; indeed the Fathers refused to hear one Bishop who appeared to be opposing it ; and the outcry was so great that he was for some time unable to explain that they had misunderstood him. Shortly after this incident an Irish Dominican, O'Hart, Bishop of Achonry, made a shrewd and practical speech against the opinion that jurisdiction is immediately from God. Speaking rather as a politician than as a scientific theologian, he pointed out the inexpediency of that doctrine, and the inconsistent conclusions to which by accepting it they would be led. He gave three reasons in support of his view. The first was that the opinion he disapproved made many heads in the Hierarchy, and so tended to anarchy rather than to unity. The second (on which more has to be said) was that it would strengthen the position of heretics. And the third was that if jurisdiction were immediately from God, the Pope would be unable to take it away, or to transfer it (as the Fathers of the Council well knew he continually did), any more than he could take away the power of Order. And Le Plat adds, "This argument seemed very much to please all." *

* "Monum. ad Hist. Conc. Trident.," tom. v. p. 578. The passage on which the alleged testimony depends is as follows :—"Acadensis Ibernus ostendit tribus rationibus non posse subsistere quod aiunt jurisdictionem immediatè esse à Deo. *Primo*, quia in hierarchiâ essent multa capita, potiusque

Clearly the Fathers were gratified, either by O'Hart's defence of the Papal origin of jurisdiction as a whole, or else (as perhaps better suits the passage) by this last argument in its favour. But the force of Dr. Forbes' contention depends on the approval of the Council having had special reference to the second argument, which we must now consider.

It was this :—If jurisdiction be admitted to be directly from God, heretics will make capital out of this admission. "Thus in England, the King calls himself Head of the English Church, and creates Bishops, who are consecrated by three Bishops, and say that they are true Bishops, as being from God. But we deny this, because they have not been acknowledged by the Roman Pontiff; and we are right in saying this, and by this one argument, and no other, we convict them; for (apart from this) they themselves show that they have been called, elected and consecrated, sent." He added that, should a canon of the Council allow that institution is only from Christ, heretics will infer that the King's election is as good as the Pope's.

The argument is in fact an assertion of the expedience of the doctrine of the Papal origin of jurisdiction as a

redderetur anarchia, ac totum everteretur. *Secundò*, quia ex eo magis confirmaretur opinio hæreticorum. Nam et in Angliâ rex vocat se caput ecclesiæ Anglicæ, et creat episcopos, qui consecrantur à tribus episcopis, aiuntque se veros episcopos, qui sunt à Deo; nos vero id negamus, quia non sunt à Pontifice Romano adsciti; et rectè dicimus, hâcque tantum ratione illos convincimus, non aliâ; nam et ipsi ostendunt se fuisse vocatos, electos, et consecratos, missos: igitur si in Canone dicatur tantum à Christo institutos, hinc inferrent electionem fieri tanquam ex nudo instrumento, quod æquale sit in omnibus, tam regi quam Papæ. *Tertiò*, quia si jurisdictio esset tota à Deo, Papa non posset illam tollere, nec transferre in aliam, sicut non potest prohibere consecratum quin ordinet et conficiat Eucharistiam. Quæ sententia omnibus placere maximè visa fuit." In Dr. Forbes' book the above extract is so inaccurately printed as to be unintelligible.

"short and easy method" of dealing with Bishops schismatically consecrated. But Dr. Forbes, by assuming that the Fathers of the Council were particularly pleased with this part of his speech, suggests the inference that they were conscious they could find no other fault with the Elizabethan consecrations beyond the lack of jurisdiction received from the Pope. It should however be observed that they were not in a position to judge the question of Anglican Orders at all. No evidence for or against them was before the Council at this, if at any, time. Nor is it clear that O'Hart had specially in his mind the Elizabethan consecrations, or that his words referred to them. Certainly, four years had elapsed since the accession of Elizabeth, and two since the consecration of Parker. Yet the Bishop speaks distinctly of "the King;" and his words precisely describe the schismatical consecrations which took place under Henry VIII. between the years 1534 and 1547, while they are less applicable to the case of the Protestant Bishops, who in fact did not until many years later make such bold assertions as those to whom he refers. Nor did Elizabeth call herself "Head of the English Church," as Henry and Edward had done, but merely "Supreme Governor." The writer does not profess to know what O'Hart's previous history had been; but there is nothing extravagant in suggesting that he must have had better opportunities of acquainting himself with the earlier rather than with the later phases of the Reformation.* And so thorough-going

* He was at this time 60 years of age, and had been only a few months previously consecrated Bishop of Achonry, in succession to his uncle, whom he appears to have accompanied to Trent. It should be noted also that no Protestant consecration took place in Ireland until 1563, a year after O'Hart's speech in the Council.

an assertor of the Papal prerogatives would never have spoken so diffidently of the *status* of the Elizabethan Bishops, who had cropped up during the last two years, had he really known anything of the mode in which they had been created. And if this be so, there is no particle of testimony to the validity of *Anglican* Orders in his speech; and anyhow there is none in the Council's approval of his words. But Dr. Forbes' interpretation of the event has been eagerly caught at by Anglican writers, and has become "an undoubted fact" in favour of their claim. As a writer in the *Month* said in September, 1868,—“We shall have people saying some day that the Council of Trent approved of Anglican Orders.” The prophecy was soon fulfilled.

But a second witness of the Council to the validity of Anglican Orders is adduced, and is thus stated:—“The Council of Trent was asked by Pius IV. to declare the Elizabethan Bishops unlawful, and it expressly refused to do so.”* The latter half of this sentence is certainly untrue, and the former is supported by no real evidence. The facts are these:—In June, 1563, shortly before the close of the Council, some Belgian theologians arrived at Trent, and reported the progress that Elizabeth had made in the destruction of Catholicism in England. The indignation of the Fathers was extreme; and it was proposed that a Bull of excommunication should at once be issued against the Queen; as was actually done eight years

* “Priest's Prayer-book,” p. 230. It is surely deplorable that so able a writer as Dr. Littledale should have put forth, and have reprinted in a cheap form for popular distribution, a defence of Anglican Orders so full of misstatements as is this “Summary of Historical Evidence.” There are errors in fact on every page; and the theological questions, as to the effect of coöperation, and the adequacy of the Anglican form, are all begged in the most dogmatic style.

later by St. Pius V. And, since the Council was at the time engaged in discussing what constituted a legitimate Bishop, the suggestion was made (if Pallavicini be correct), and was approved by the Pope, Pius IV., that a sentence should be inserted in the Bull, as a kind of *obiter dictum*, stating that they were no lawful Bishops whom the Queen had made.* But the whole matter was shelved, not on account of any opposition in the Council, but simply on grounds of political expedience. The Emperor's ambassadors secured his intervention, and by his advice no further step was at that time taken. There is no further reference to the Anglican Bishops; and the reason given for not proceeding against the Queen was that it would only exasperate her against "the few Bishops who remain in England,"—there were still seven at this date,—the very existence of the Bishops of Elizabeth's making being thus ignored.

It is not easy to see what testimony to the validity of Anglican Orders can be extracted from this event.† If

* Pallavicini, "History of the Council of Trent" (Latin Version), book xxi. chap. vii. § 5. The passage referred to is as follows:—The narrative of the Belgian theologians "succenderat Tridenti consilia vibrandi decreta in impiam Angliæ Reginam; et Pontifici consilium probabatur, cum ipsi aptus ad id locus videretur in quo agebatur de legitimis Episcopis, quippe quod illic licebat pronuntiare hujusmodi non esse Episcopos à Regina assumptos, simulque eam esse schismaticam et hæreticam. Quam sententiam ab Æcumenico Synodo latam sperabat ille inflammaturam fuisse Catholicos principes ad opem armis ferendam vexatis illis et oppressis fidelibus: sed postea Cæsariani Oratores considerandum Legatis objecerunt ea quæ iisdem Legatis et Pontifici scripserat Delfinus Nuntius: Si Elizabethæ hujusmodi infligeretur, eam efferatam exercituram fuisse lanienam in paucos illos Episcopos qui in Angliâ remanebant."

† The writer has permission to publish the following communication from Canon Estcourt:—"When I was in Rome in 1856 I had leave from the Fathers of the Society of Jesus to look through Pallavicini's collections, and I found the papers he refers to on this point. There is a proposal which seems to have come from the English exiles, and another paper marked "B," the source of which is left in the dark. Both these papers propose to excom-

it proved anything, it would prove too much, that is, it would be its own refutation by its very extravagance. It is simply grotesque to say that the Council refused, even at the Pope's request, to declare the Anglican Bishops *unlawful*. No Catholic can have doubted of this, even if persuaded that the consecrations were valid. And had it been true, as it certainly is not, that the Council refused to declare them invalid, there would still have been nothing in favour of the Anglican claim, unless it could also be shown that an investigation had been made. That the Anglican Bishops were unlawful was clear on Catholic principles, for they had sought no recognition from Rome. That they were no Bishops at all in the Catholic sense would have been equally clear from the "urgency of visible facts," had any evidence of the character of the new English State religion been laid before the Fathers. But it is pretty clear that they knew nothing of Parker's consecration or of the Anglican Ordinal; and a refusal to condemn (had such been the case) when no evidence has been produced, is not the same thing as a verdict of acquittal. But in truth, the passage in Pallavicini, even if it be accurate, has no

municate and deprive the Queen, but there is not a word in either of them referring to the Anglican Bishops. The question was referred to the Pope, and there is a letter from St. Charles Borromeo conveying the Pope's approval of its being done. But the Emperor's ambassadors had written to him, and he at once interfered and stopped it, and especially on the ground that the excommunication of the Queen would lead to harsher measures against the Catholic Bishops in England, perhaps to their being put to death. There is their letter to him and his reply. I have copies of all these papers. I cannot account for Pallavicini's statement about the Anglican Bishops, and believe it to be an error. I cannot find anything to support it in Paleotti's Acts of the Council, nor in those lately published by Theiner. I did not touch on the Council of Trent in my book, because there is nothing connected with it really bearing on the controversy, and because the proposal referred to is so mixed up with political matters which I was anxious to avoid."

serious bearing, save on the question of the Queen's excommunication ; and as a witness to the validity of Anglican Orders, it is merely one of those straws at which the upholders of that theory nervously clutch, in default of substantial arguments on which to depend.

This same Pope Pius IV., whom we have just seen employed as above, to elicit from the Council of Trent, in opposition to his own expressed opinion, a profession of faith in the lawfulness of the Elizabethan Bishops, somewhat strangely reappears as the hero in another Anglican legend, wherein he offers to recognise the Elizabethan Church of England, Prayer-book, Orders, and all, if only the Queen will acknowledge his Supremacy. Such at least is the "undoubted fact," as it is from time to time repeated or hinted at in the High Church newspapers.

That during the first few years of Elizabeth's reign the Pope was exceedingly anxious and hopeful about the reconciliation of the English Queen, and with her of the English nation, to the Holy See, is certain. He wrote to her to that effect in May, 1560, a singularly beautiful letter, which is still extant.* At the same time he sent Parpaglia, and in the following year Martinengo, to treat with her with a view to such reconciliation. But neither of them was permitted to land in England. Martinengo is said to have carried with him letters "of a very smooth contents ;" and it is added that he was authorised to tell the Queen that, if she would send Bishops or ambassadors to the Council, they would be given "such satisfaction as might open the way to a farther accommodation." But it by no means follows that Anglican Bishops, if sent, would have been admitted to the Council as such. Lay-

* It will be found at length in Dodd, vol. ii. appendix xlvii.

men and Protestant ministers of all kinds were similarly invited to come and make known their mind to the Fathers.

It is not, however, on Martinengo's mission, but on Parpaglia's, that the legend we are noticing is based. His private instructions have never been made known; and though Heylin and Burnet profess to have heard that in them the Pope expressed his willingness to accept the Anglican Prayer-book and to admit the Queen's legitimacy, their assertion is founded on mere rumour, which Fuller says originated with some who, "more daring in conjectures than others, love to feign what they cannot find, that they may never appear to be at a loss." The special offer to recognise Anglican Orders, which is after all the only part of the story that immediately concerns us, seems to be an addition of recent years.

A corporate return of the whole English nation to Catholic unity was, in the year 1560, by no means an improbable event, and it is possible that the Pope, in his zeal for this most desirable consummation, may have contemplated the grant of certain privileges to a restored Catholic Church of England; but that he had in view the recognition of the Prayer-book, as a whole, and of the Anglican Bishops and priests as such, is an assertion supported by no evidence, and is in itself wholly incredible. How entirely devoid of solid foundation is the story, will be seen when it is added that it was not gravely put forth until 1606, forty years after the death of Pope Pius IV., and then with absurd inconsistencies; for the offer was ascribed by Lord Chief Justice Coke to St. Pius V., and by Bishop Andrewes to Paul IV.* This last-named Pontiff had died before the

* See Estcourt, pp. 354-370.

use of the Elizabethan Prayer-book was established ; and how far St. Pius V. was disposed to recognise the Anglican system may be gathered from the language of his Bull *Regnans in excelsis*, wherein he states that Elizabeth had replaced the Catholic clergy by "shameless preachers and ministers of impiety," had "abolished the Sacrifice of the Mass, and had imposed upon her whole kingdom books containing manifest heresy ;" while he describes the Anglican Communion Service as "a profane mystery in accordance with the system of Calvin." It is hardly likely that Pius IV. was prepared unreservedly to accept what ten years later his successor thus denounced.

Only a few words will be needed to deal with the alleged testimony of Pope Innocent XII. to the validity of Anglican Orders. It is in fact simply ludicrous to bring him forward in evidence ; though to Dr. Lee it seems "natural and easy" to draw such a conclusion from an opinion ascribed to him. The facts are these :—Sancroft, the Non-juring ex-Archbishop of Canterbury, asked James II., whom, though a Catholic and dethroned, he still regarded as Head of his Church, to sanction the consecration of two Non-juring Bishops, by way of continuing the succession. The act, whatever might be its validity, would of course have been one of hostility towards the Anglican Establishment, over which William and Mary were now supreme ; and so James consulted the Archbishop of Paris and Bossuet as to what he should do. They told him, what all Catholic Bishops would tell a Catholic sovereign under similar circumstances, that he was "under no obligation to act against the Established Church." Anxious to do what was right, under the guidance of the highest authority, James also consulted the Pope, Innocent XII., whose answer is said to have been "to the same effect." *Ergo*, Dr. Lee concludes, the

Pope believed in Anglican Orders. As Canon Raynal remarks, it is just as "natural and easy" to infer that he accepted the Thirty-nine Articles.*

So far as the writer is aware, no other grave Catholic authorities in favour of Anglican Orders have been adduced, save these which have now been examined, perhaps at tedious length. And if, as we may fairly demand, their irrelevance be now conceded, it would appear that the witness of the Church to the nullity of the Anglican Priesthood is absolutely unbroken. The only serious objection that can be raised to the cogency of that witness is the fact that the rejection of Anglican Orders by the Church has not been preceded by any thorough investigation of the evidence that can be produced on either side. It is true that no formal and final decision has ever been pronounced by authority ; † and it may be added that it is quite unlikely that the future will hear of any such decision ; for indeed it is not necessary.

* That Bossuet believed in Anglican Orders is confirmed by the following incident. When asked by a friend his opinion on the subject, he replied, "*Cela dépend des faits.*" Hence it is clear, &c. It is true, however, that on another occasion, without expressing a decided opinion, he did allow that the Anglican argument seemed to him to have the best of it.

† The decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition in the year 1704, in the case of Dr. Gordon, who had been Protestant Bishop of Glasgow, and who, through the influence of Bossuet, was reconciled to the Church, can hardly claim this character. He petitioned to be declared a layman, and his petition was granted, after the formal consideration of only such evidence as he was able to produce; though there may have been in the Congregation men who had from other sources fairly accurate information as to the nature of the Anglican Ministry. But it is difficult to see what occasion there was for the decree at all ; unless it were to satisfy Gordon's private scruples about offering himself for Catholic ordination. For there was already in possession at Rome a tradition of the nullity of Anglican Orders. A hundred years or so before Gordon's case was considered, more than one convert Anglican clergyman had been ordained *ab initio* in Rome itself. And, absurdly enough, the terms of his own petition begged the whole question ; for he described himself as *consecratus à pseudo-Archiepiscopo et tribus pseudo-Episcopis*. See Estcourt, appendix xxxvi.

Practically, as Dodd has pointed out in his "Dissertation concerning the Validity of Protestant Ordinations," appended to the second volume of his *Church History*, the Church's judgment on Anglican Orders was pronounced in Mary's reign, six years before Parker's consecration.* Cardinal Pole and the other Bishops had before their eyes abundant evidence of the nature of Edwardine Orders, and there was no need formally to investigate their validity and to pronounce a sentence upon them. Of course to Anglicans themselves in the present day, after a reactionary movement more or less continuous of some three centuries duration, their Orders come with a kind of traditional validity, which is further supported by the modern use of Catholic language and ceremonial; and it seems to them utterly rash and culpable for the Church to treat as null without any inquiry, the Orders of a Ritualistic priest, who, may-be for years before his submission to Rome, had worn a chasuble and professed to give sacramental absolution. But *nullum tempus occurrit Ecclesiæ*. The Edwardine rites for Anglican ordination, which had been set aside with contempt in Mary's reign, were unearthed again in 1559, and were used continuously until 1662; and the Church does not need to be told that Anglican Orders in the nineteenth century, though highly spiced with a foreign Catholicism, are neither more nor less valid than the same Orders were in the sixteenth century, when, impregnated with their native Protestantism, they appeared in their true colours. *Quod ab initio nullum est, tractu temporis non convalescit.*

* So also Gazzaniga ("Prælect. Theol.," Dissert. viii. cap. iv. § 112, "De Sacramentis," Venice, 1803), "Controversia autem definita tunc fuisse videbatur, quando sub Reginâ catholicâ Mariâ, quæ hæretico Eduardo VI. anno 1553 feliciter successit, Reginaldo Polo Cardinali, et Sedis Apostolicæ Legato agente, omnes Episcoporum ordinationes factæ sub præcedenti regno Eduardi irritæ habitæ sunt."

That Orders consistently disallowed during so long a period, should at a later time be recognised as valid, is, no doubt, in the highest degree improbable ; yet it may perhaps be said that the Church would be readier to pronounce such a favourable judgment than she would be to reject, without any change of circumstances, Orders which she had hitherto allowed as valid. While then we contend that the *primâ facie* evidence against the reality of the Anglican Priesthood was from the first too strong to allow a reasonable presumption in its favour to arise in Catholic minds, yet it is right to add that the Church's action in the future is free. The question being one of facts pure and simple, *i.e.*, not one of facts which have a direct bearing on doctrine or morals, she might at some future time decide in favour of the Anglican claim without any detriment to her infallibility ; but that such a decision will ever be made, is, all things being considered, outside the region of probability ; and meanwhile her uniform action leaves no room for serious doubt, and is in practice a safe guide to which all her children willingly conform.

§ 19. *Preliminary Remarks to the Discussion of the Theological Evidence.*

If what has been asserted above be correct—viz., that the judgment of the Church on the validity of Anglican Orders was practically though not formally pronounced in Mary's reign, it follows that their rejection was due, not to any alleged breach in the historical continuity of the succession (no such charge could be brought against the Edwardine consecrations), but to a conviction of the theological insufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal. It is important to bear this in mind ; for some Anglican writers have maintained that Catholics raised no theological objections to the validity of Anglican Orders until the seventeenth century, and that they did so then because they found that the ground on which they had hitherto rested (the non-consecration of Parker) had been cut away from their feet by the production of the Lambeth Register. But if it be true that Anglican Orders were rejected on theological grounds even before Parker was consecrated, it is clear that doubts about that event did not form the substantial cause of that rejection.

When it is remembered that in the sixteenth century the Scholastic opinion (which made the essence of priestly ordination to consist in the ceremony known as the "tradition of the instruments," together with the form used therewith) was universally accepted, two things at once become clear ;—one being that the compilers of the Anglican Ordinal could not have contemplated the retention within the Church of England of the sacrificial Priesthood, inasmuch as they deliberately omitted the rite which in their day all men thought was absolutely

necessary to secure its transmission,—and the other being that Catholics had no choice but to reject the validity of ordinations from which the very substance of the Sacrament appeared to have been excluded.* Taking then the Scholastic opinion for granted, it is easy to show that Cardinal Pole, and those who acted with him, could not have done otherwise than regard as null the Orders of an Edwardine “priest;” but it may be admitted that it is less easy to show that the opinion on which they based that rejection was correct. Yet, even if we allow that it is not now commonly accepted, it does not follow that the principle on which it was based was wrong; indeed the writer ventures to affirm that a careful consideration of the theological evidence, which we have now approached, will lead to the conviction that the principle was altogether right, and that it was the same as that which throughout the history of the controversy has guided all Catholics who have studied the question to the same conclusion—viz., that the Anglican Church has no Priesthood in the Catholic sense.

As has been already stated, it forms no part of the subject of the present Essay to define, expound, or defend, the Catholic doctrine of the Christian Priesthood.† We assume that those with whom we are now concerned admit that there is in the Gospel dispensation a visible

* It is true that both Catholics and Reformers might have appealed to the practice of the Council of Florence in the fifteenth century, where the validity of Oriental Orders, conferred without the “tradition of the instruments” was recognised. But there is no evidence that either party made any account of this important act; which indeed, singularly enough, had no perceptible influence over the teaching of theologians until the seventeenth century.

† Some extracts from a work of acknowledged authority on this subject will be found in the Appendix, Note VIII., on “The Catholic Doctrine of Holy Order;” with which may be compared the “Catechism of the Council of Trent,” part ii. chapter vii.

and external *Sacerdotium*, properly so called, with power to consecrate and offer in sacrifice the Body and Blood of Christ, and with power also to remit or retain sins. The Protestant opponents of this doctrine have depended mainly on an argument from silence in the New Testament. They have urged (and with great plausibility, if the bare letter of Scripture be the sole rule of faith) that the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles do not warrant the notion that the Apostles and their successors received sacerdotal power,—that their principal function needed an altar for its due discharge. They have insisted on the fact that Christian ministers, as such, are not once called *sacerdotes* in the New Testament ; and they have gone on to prove to their own satisfaction that sacerdotalism is a corruption of primitive Christianity. Now if these divines (and there are many such among Anglicans) are content to argue that the Church of England manifests the truly Apostolical character of her ministerial succession by claiming to be served by a Scriptural and unsacerdotal Ministry, which merely as a matter of decency and order has been transmitted by lawful authority from “convert” Bishops in the sixteenth century, no man being allowed to act as or call himself a clergyman without some due and formal ordination,—there is no occasion here to dispute such a claim. Our controversy is not now with men of this school, but with those who make an explicit profession of faith in the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood, and who go on to assert that they are themselves in possession of its powers.

These last have perhaps done even more than Catholics to draw from the language of Scripture a proof of the doctrine in question. They have felt more keenly the need to do so. They have therefore scrutinised and carefully weighed the prophetic anticipations of the sacerdotal character of the Ministry of the future Kingdom of

Heaven, and the rare instances of hieratic expressions applied by St. Paul to his own office or to the Eucharistic rite. They have urged the force of the word "altar" used in the Epistle to the Hebrews ; and they have dwelt on the doctrine of the Priesthood of Christ, and on the consequently necessary Priesthood of those whom he left in the world to represent him. They have pointed in the Epistles of St. Peter, and in the Apocalypse, to the acknowledgment of the Priesthood of the whole Christian people ; and from this they have deduced that there must be at least a fuller measure of this office in the Christian Ministry. And lastly, they have very reasonably accounted for the lack of more definitely sacerdotal expressions in the earliest times, on the ground that, so long as the Temple stood and the Jewish Priesthood and sacrifices continued, the announcement in the same terms of a Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice would only have confirmed the suspicion that the Christians were but a Jewish sect.

Catholics of course have no quarrel with High Churchmen for thus attempting to rebuild the edifice which their fathers certainly intended to destroy, and, as is most probable, so far as the Church of England is concerned, actually succeeded in destroying. For although such arguments as the above are necessarily incomplete, they pave the way for many to return to the old truths concerning the nature and work of the Christian Ministry, which the Catholic Church, as all confess, has never ceased to teach and put into practice.*

* Any one who has read and understood a Catholic treatise *De Ordine*, and who has had opportunity to contrast its teaching with the lame, incoherent, contradictory and unreal utterances of Anglican divines on the same subject, will share the astonishment with which the writer lighted upon these words in the article in the *Church Quarterly* already referred to :—"The Roman Church does not grasp the conception of Holy Orders as a great reality, but thinks of them as a mere human opinion." What cannot ignorance combined with prejudice produce !

§ 20. *Primâ Facie Evidence Furnished by the Anglican Ordinal.*

In estimating the theological value of the Anglican ordination rites, we may confine ourselves to the forms used in the sixteenth century ; for unless these sufficed to continue the succession, the additions made in 1662 could not avail to mend a broken chain, any more than the modern æsthetic surroundings of Anglican worship would of themselves suffice to change a Protestant Communion Service into the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Now the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal says, "It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." And a little later it is added that the Ordinal is put forth "to the intent these Orders should be continued, used, and esteemed in this Church of England." Clearly then it was the intention of the Reformers to preserve in the Anglican Church what they believed to be the Ministry instituted by Christ, and transmitted by the Apostles to their successors. Nor should the force of the word "continued" be overlooked. It implies a recognition of the fact that the Catholic Church had handed down this Ministry to the actual possessors of the offices of Bishop and priest when the Reformation began, who were thus in a position to invest others with what they had themselves received. We have here a distinct witness to the generally good intention with which the Anglican Ordinal was devised.

But it is easy to make too much of this good intention. It was no peculiarity of the English, as distinguished from

the foreign Reformers. All the various Protestant communities formed in the sixteenth century had the same end in view. None had any thought of devising a Ministry other than that which Christ had instituted and the Apostles had transmitted. Nor did they venture to re-establish the primitive Evangelical Ministry without some pretence of succession from the old Catholic Hierarchy. There is no evidence of any serious divergence of opinion between the English and other Reformers on this point. None appear to have strongly insisted on the necessity of such succession; but neither did any wholly disregard it. It is true that in England the succession retained was at least nominally Episcopal, whereas abroad, save in Denmark and Sweden, the Reformers were content with a Presbyterian succession; or perhaps rather preferred it; for it was not for want of apostate Bishops, who might have continued the succession, that Episcopacy was abandoned by the German Lutherans; but they did so on the ground that Presbytery was the most Scriptural form of Church government. Nor did the English Reformers strongly dissent from this view; they merely contended that Episcopacy was a venerable institution, allowed in Scripture, and well suited to the temper of the English nation; and it was the State, rather than the Reformed Church, which took such pains to preserve at least the appearance of a regular Episcopal succession; and this with an aim more political than religious. And in estimating the nature of the Episcopacy that was thus preserved, we must bear in mind that foreign Protestants had fully as much to do with the composition of the Anglican Ordinal as had the English Reforming Bishops.

But whatever controversy there may have been between them in regard to the names by which the various grades of the Evangelical Ministry should be known, there was

none as to the advisability, if not the necessity, of retaining a succession. It was the opinion common to them all that within the Catholic Church the genuine Christian Ministry really existed, though overlaid with such a mass of corruption and falsehood as to have been pretty nearly transformed into something quite different. And they all held that the establishment of the Protestant Ministry was a restoration and a purification, rather than a new foundation. All then acted with an intention technically sufficient, according to the common doctrine of theologians ; yet High Churchmen unanimously aver that everywhere save in England this good intention was ineffectual ; and its failure they trace to a breach in the succession among the Scandinavian Protestants, and elsewhere to some error concerning the theology of Holy Order which was followed in practice, *e.g.*, to the opinion that a Presbyterian succession suffices.

When therefore we seek to ascertain whether it be true that the Anglican Church, alone among Protestant Churches, succeeded in retaining the Ministry of divine institution, we have to inquire whether those who compiled and used the Anglican ordination rites, employed safe means to secure the transmission of so precious a gift ; or whether they did not in fact follow such erroneous opinions concerning the nature of that Ministry as actually to frustrate their intention. This brings us at once to the question of the sufficiency or insufficiency of the "matter" and "form" which the Anglican Ordinal contained. But before entering upon that discussion in detail, it will be serviceable to point out that our suspicions are at once aroused by the obvious fact that the Anglican rites made no pretence to preserve the whole Catholic Hierarchy as it existed in England at the time that those rites were compiled. Clearly then the compilers thought themselves

at liberty to use their private judgment in bringing the Ministry into conformity with what appeared to them to be a primitive and Scriptural model.

Now the existence of the three Orders specified in the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal is not perhaps so "evident" as is there asserted. Most Protestants would maintain that Scripture says nothing about Christian priests, and does not clearly indicate more than two distinct Orders—viz., the Diaconate, to minister in temporal things, and what they might term the "Pastorate," to minister in spiritual things. They would urge that in this latter are to be included those whom the Protestant Version of the New Testament sometimes terms "Bishops" and sometimes "overseers,"* together with those who in the Catholic Bible are, no doubt, called "priests," but whom they would themselves style "presbyters," or, as the Protestant Version has it, "elders;" and they would maintain that there is no certain distinction of Order between them.

On the other hand, readers of the "ancient Authors" (while admitting the testimony of antiquity to the Orders specified, and agreeing in the main with Protestants as to the essential unity between the first two, inasmuch as until the end of the second century Bishops were sometimes

* Dr. Fulke, in replying to Dr. Gregory Martin's criticisms on the Protestant Bibles circulated in England during the sixteenth century, thus defends the use of various terms, *e.g.*, "deacon" and "minister," or "Bishop" and "overseer" to represent the same Greek words:—"If a 'Bishop' be mistaken by the people either for such an idol as the Papists used to make of their St. Nicholas Bishops, or else for a great lord only that rideth about in a white rochet; they may be told that the name of a Bishop describeth his office, that is to be an overseer of the flock of Christ committed to his charge. Likewise, if the word 'deacon' be taken for such an one as at a Popish Mass standeth in a disguised tunicle, holding a paten, or some other idolatrous bauble used of them; the people must be taught that this name signifieth a minister, which was ordained, not to serve the Popish altar, but the poor men's tables."—"Defence of the English Translations," p. 218.

termed *Presbyteri*, while until a much later date they and simple priests were indifferently styled *Sacerdotes*) will go on to complain of the scantiness of the Anglican list, since it makes no mention of five other Orders, Doorkeeper, Exorcist, Reader, Acolyte, and Subdeacon, whose offices certainly existed as early as the year 254; for Eusebius gives the number of each in the city of Rome at that date; and his passing mention implies that even then they were no novelty.* In any case they had all existed in the English Church since its first foundation up to the time of the Reformation; and to give up even one of them would have been an irreverent and sacrilegious act, and a breach with venerable and continuous tradition; in short, an ecclesiastical crime such as has never been committed by any other sacerdotal community separating from the unity of the Church, save by the Church of England, if such she be. The Reformers however appealed to their own private interpretation of Scripture and antiquity against the living tradition of the Church; and this appeal was in their case, as it always has been and always will be, a sure sign that they were infected with heretical notions, necessitating such an act of unfaithfulness to the living voice of the Church.

Now the Catholic Church has seven degrees of Order, four Minor, and three Major or Sacred; and the highest of these, the *Sacerdotium*, is further sub-divided into the Presbyterate and the Episcopate.† All are what they are in relation to the Holy Eucharist, regarded both as a Sacrifice and as a Sacrament, the celebration of which is the

* Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles.," lib. vi. cap. 43, § 12. He is quoting the words of Pope Cornelius.

† The unity of the *Sacerdotium* lies in the fact that the Episcopate receives no new power directly relating to the Holy Eucharist which the Presbyterate does not already possess. To the Bishop however is reserved the power of continuing the succession.

main scope of Holy Orders ; and full power to consecrate and offer the Body of Christ is committed to the Priesthood, the highest Order in the Church. With regard then to the rejection by the Reformers of the four Minor Orders, we will not say more (and we cannot say less) than this, that it was a profane act, calculated to arouse the gravest suspicions as to the soundness of their faith in the Sacrament of Holy Order, and in the end to which it was instituted. More than this need not be said ; for theologians hold that their reception is not a necessary preliminary to the validity of Sacred Orders afterwards conferred, though in practice they are never omitted.

Much the same may be said with regard to what is however a more serious affair, the rejection of the Subdiaconate, the first of the Sacred Orders.* No Catholic needs to be told of its importance, for it involves the life-long dedication to the service of God, the obligation to celibacy, and the recitation of the Divine Office. Its disappearance then in the Anglican Church is gravely significant ; though, being of ecclesiastical and not of divine precept, its omission need not invalidate the reception of the higher Orders, if in other respects duly conferred.

We come now to the Diaconate ; and here at least Anglicans hold that their claim is good. It is not however easy to ascertain what ecclesiastical position the Anglican deacon occupies. Dissenting communities have a Diaconate, which they consider eminently Scriptural in character, as it has to do mainly with temporal matters. But the Anglican office differs somewhat from this, inasmuch as it is a sort of year's probation, preceding the reception of "full Orders." What however concerns us here is the Ritualist's assertion that the Anglican deacon

* Originally the Subdiaconate was not a Sacred Order ; nor is it such now in the East.

is in all respects the same as the Catholic, and that his business is to wear a stole and dalmatic, and to sing the Gospel at High Mass.

Now the Catholic deacon has something sacerdotal about him. The Order immediately behind which he stands, reflects back on him something of its character. In liturgical books he is commonly called a "Levite," and his chief office is to assist the priest in the Holy Sacrifice. At his ordination the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* is used, with the imposition of the Bishop's hand ; he is clothed with the various insignia of his Order, and the Book of the Gospels is solemnly committed to him to be touched, and that as a sacramental act.

But the Anglican formulary has cut out all allusion to the Levitical character of the Diaconate ; the stole and dalmatic are absent ; and the ceremony of making a deacon, the form of which is admitted to be without precedent in any time or place, does not profess to be more than the mere granting by imposition of hands of authority (there is no hint of any sacramental grace) to execute an assistant Ministry. What the character of that assistance is will depend on the character of the Ministry to which it is afforded. If the one be sacrificial, so will be the other ; if not, not. But since theologians commonly hold that a layman may be validly ordained to the Priesthood *per saltum*, it would be irrelevant to our purpose to discuss at length the sufficiency of the Anglican form for the ordination of a deacon. Leaving then the question with the mere statement that no Catholic admits its sufficiency, we approach the real battle-ground of the controversy.

§ 21. *Principles by which to Judge the Sufficiency of
an Ordination Rite.*

For about a hundred years after the establishment of the Elizabethan Hierarchy, the Church of England thus ordained her priests :—After the people had been exhorted secretly to make supplication for the candidates, the Bishop said a prayer, or rather a thanksgiving, in which, singularly enough, nothing was impetrated on their behalf, for its only petition was this, “ We humbly beseech thee . . . to grant unto all us, which either here or elsewhere call upon thy name, that we may show ourselves thankful to thee for these and all other thy benefits, and that we may daily increase and go forwards in the knowledge and faith of thee and thy Son by the Holy Spirit. So that as well by these thy ministers, as by them to whom they shall be appointed ministers, thy holy name may be always glorified, and thy blessed kingdom enlarged.” Then the Bishop, with the priests present, laid their hands severally upon the head of each that received Orders, while the Bishop said, “ Receive the Holy Ghost : whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained ; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy Sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.” Then he gave each of them a Bible, saying, “ Take thou authority to preach the word of God and to minister the holy Sacraments in this Congregation, where thou shalt be so appointed.” Finally, just before the conclusion of the service, the Bishop prayed, “ We beseech thee so to send upon these thy servants thy heavenly blessing, that they may be clad about with all justice, and that thy word

spoken by their mouths may have such success that it may never be spoken in vain."

Now when we seek to estimate the value of this formulary, we must begin by calling to mind how it was that it ever came into existence at all.* And as to the history of its origin there can be no possible dispute. It was one of the fruits of the great anti-Catholic movement of the sixteenth century, and Cranmer and Bucer are commonly held to have been principally concerned in its compilation. Their names ought, moreover, to render equally indisputable the Catholic assertion that the motive of its production was an heretical one, and that its editors were not merely aiming at the removal of what might be thought a too elaborate and unnecessary ceremonial, but that they were actuated by a deliberate intention to make fundamental changes, such as should secure the foundation of what they deemed an Evangelical Ministry. If the rites in the Sarum Pontifical be placed side by side with the Anglican Ordinal, it becomes clear that they who devised the latter had very little tenderness for the ancient mode of ordination. Indeed it may be doubted whether they retained anything because they found it already in use, and not rather because it could be defended as Scriptural. Nor is there any evidence that they aimed at assimilating their work to ancient or Oriental rites. It is true that some of the Reformers spoke respectfully of antiquity, and professed to make it their guide, where they

* "We should advise nobody to study the real history [of the composition of the Anglican form of ordination], who has not nerve enough to recognise how close the Church of England lay in those days to mere Protestantism."—*Church Quarterly*, Jan. 1878. "Nerve" appears here to mean "prejudices in favour of the High Church theory of Anglicanism sufficiently strong to enable him to set aside the conclusion that the Anglican Church is a merely human and Protestant institution; for to this he will be inevitably led by a study of its origin and real history."

thought it to be in harmony with Scripture. It is true also that they were acquainted with Greek, and that about this time the primitive Greek liturgies were beginning to become known in the West.* But it is enough to observe that the Anglican Ordinal contains nothing to indicate that it ever was subject to any such influences ; and it must therefore be added that the verbal resemblance, which it has of late years been found to bear to a certain peculiar case of Abyssinian ordination, can only be accounted an accident, nor can the one be safely taken to illustrate the other, inasmuch as the Anglican compilers cannot possibly have had any such precedent before them (the case to which we refer had not in fact occurred) when they retained the form in question. In short, what the Reformers had in view was the production of a revised edition (if such it can be called) of the Catholic Ordinal, so thoroughly expurgated from its superstitious accretions (as they deemed the far greater part of its ceremonies to be) as to continue in the Church of England what in their judgment was the pure Christian Ministry, and not that anti-Christian Priesthood, which was the form in which the Ministry had come down to them ; for of this they sought by every means to be rid. Thus, without denying that the Church had been the means of handing down from Apostolic times the Ministry that Christ had originally founded, they also held that therein it had been well-nigh overwhelmed and destroyed under a load of false and corrupt teaching. No other explanation short of this is sufficient to account for their action in the matter.

And if this be so, it follows that in substituting the new "form and manner of ordaining" for those ancient rites with which they were themselves familiar, Cranmer and

* The "Liturgy of St. James" had been published in Rome in 1526.

those who aided him had not merely in view the formation of an independent national Church, which, while separate from the rest of Christendom, should still retain all the characteristics of Catholicism ; they were not actuated by antiquarian zeal for primitive ceremonial ; nor were they influenced by a taste for Oriental, in preference to Occidental rites ; but they made the change with a distinct intention, and that intention on Catholic principles distinctly heretical—viz., the substitution in the Church of England of a “ Gospel Ministry ” in place of the sacrificial Priesthood of the Catholic Church. The writer does not see how this can be denied as a plain historical fact ; though he is at the same time prepared to admit to a hearing the plea that such an intention need not necessarily have been effective ; or in other words, that the changes, though made of set purpose, may not have been sufficient for that purpose. And an Anglican, who has a serious belief in the special and providential mission of his Church, is quite at liberty to maintain that those changes were in fact divinely overruled so as to hinder the loss of valid Orders in the Church of England ; and in support of this view he may urge, with no little force, that Bishops and not mere priests were employed to found the Anglican Ministry, that they professed to ordain priests, as well as to consecrate their own successors, and that they used a form, “ Receive the Holy Ghost,” which, in its natural and obvious sense, seems to be sacramental, and therefore sufficient, in its intention and effect.

Now a Catholic Bishop cannot in ordaining deliberately make any change in the Church’s rites without sin, which would be grave in proportion to the extent of the change he should make. Yet there are some he might make without invalidating his act, though such proceedings would be regarded as unlawful, and would subject both

himself and the persons consenting to be thus ordained to serious censures. Whether he might deliberately substitute for the rite in the Roman Pontifical some other rite of acknowledged validity in itself, and by the use of it validly ordain, is disputed among theologians for reasons that will appear later. With regard, however, to changes of detail, the accustomed rite being ostensibly preserved, it is clear that certain omissions would invalidate the whole act, while others would only render it doubtful. The general principle by which these changes may be distinguished is this, that such as affect the substance of the rite, or are calculated to give it a new character in common estimation, cannot be made without extreme peril to the validity of the act. Gury thus states the common opinion of theologians :—*Omnis mutatio substantialis in materiâ et formâ Sacramenti invalidat Sacramentum, quia non est amplius ritus à Christo institutus*. And what is meant by a substantial change he thus explains :—*Mutatio substantialis erit in materiâ si juxtâ hominum usum et æstimationem hæc eadem dici non possit ac ea quæ à Christo determinata est ; in formâ vero, si sensus verborum à Christo intentus in alium mutetur*.* These principles are, however, less readily applicable to the validity of ordinations than to that of baptisms ; inasmuch as in the former case our Lord appears to have only instituted the matter and form *in genere*, and to have left its further determination to the Church. But the reference to the form becoming substantially changed, if the sense of the words be corrupted, should be carefully noted. As will appear later, the objection to the validity of Anglican ordinations on the ground that, what theologians regard as the Catholic form, was not merely changed, but omitted alto-

* Gury, "De Sacramentis in Genere," § 198.

gether, is met by Anglicans (with what justice need not here be questioned) by the assertion that one valid form was dropped to give place to another, shorter, no doubt, and less expressive, but still equally valid, since it bore the same sense, as Catholics have admitted, by allowing the sufficiency of the very same form when used elsewhere. But the question is, whether the same words do in fact always bear the same sense ; and if they do not, it follows that a form, valid as used in one sense, might be vitiated by its use in another. And the obvious fact that the Reformers could have had no serious objection to the retention of the ancient Catholic form, save that they did not approve its sense, is surely good evidence that they did not replace it by a form which bore that same sense.

We have now in view what may be described as the public and official intention with which an ordination rite may be drawn up, authorised, and accepted ; as contrasted with the private intention of the officiant, which accompanies his actual administration of the Sacraments. This latter will be discussed in a section below ; and it is important that it should not be confused with the former, as is commonly done ; for the admission of its technical sufficiency in the case of Anglican ordinations is thus made to cover the intention with which the Anglican rites were compiled, which is a very different thing. What we are now contending for is that bare words do not secure validity, unless it can be shown that they bear a certain significance. Tournely is to the point here :—*Substantialis vero est mutatio formæ cum idem non remanet verborum sensus. Non in sono quippe sed in sensu ac significatione potissimum vis verborum posita est.** The words in fact may remain, but their sufficiency as a form be lost,

* Tournely, "De Sacramentis in Genere," Quæst. i. Art. iv.

for lack of due meaning ; whereas, if the same sense be expressly retained, verbal alterations do not invalidate the act. An illustration will make this clear.

Suppose a Protestant community were formally to reject the Catholic doctrine of baptism. Regeneration in that Sacrament is condemned as "a blasphemous fable," and it is pointed out that "to baptise" is merely Greek for "to dip," and has reference only to an external symbolical washing, which has nothing to do with the soul, but only affects the body. Very considerable changes are made in the mode of the administration itself, in order to protect the purity of this singularly primitive doctrine. The minister pours water on the child, using indeed the correct form, but expressly and notoriously employing the words as having reference to nothing but a material cleansing of the body. No valid Sacrament could be safely looked for under such circumstances. On the other hand, if a pedantic scholar, solely in the interests of linguistic purism, were to employ the English "I dip" in place of the Greek "I baptise," with the full intention thereby to confer Christian baptism, he would demonstrate his own foolishness, certainly, but he would not invalidate his act.

Another example of the effect of explicit reservation of the sense of words may be given. A Bishop, we will suppose, is, somewhat extravagantly, in the habit of giving his blessing privately with imposition of hands and the form, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* ; intending thereby, as his friends well know, to invoke the divine blessing on the man who kneels before him, to the end that he may worthily discharge whatever may be the duties of his office. He thus sanctions and confirms the appointment of his new private secretary, whose onerous duties he feels demand a special grace. Now no serious person would maintain that by such an act a priest would inadvertently

be ordained, however clear it might be that under other circumstances this same ceremony would have that effect. Indeed, to take the contrary view would be to reduce the Christian Sacraments to the level of the mechanical charms and spells found among heathen nations ; whereas, according to the teaching of the Church, they are distinctly reasonable actions ; without which characteristic, indeed, it could not be maintained that they have been divinely instituted for the sake of reasonable men. All, however, that is here insisted upon is that there may be no little gravity in a change, which preserves a form valid in itself, without preserving the necessary significance on which that validity depends.

Now it will be our aim to show that the whole idea of the Evangelical Ministry, established in the Church of England in the sixteenth century, differed so completely from the idea of the Catholic Ministry, of which it was nominally the continuation, that we cannot fail to draw the conclusion that the means by which so marked a change was brought about, was a substantial change in the mode of ordination, so thorough as to have deprived Protestant ordination of all the essential characteristics of a Sacrament, and so to have rendered it invalid in the Catholic sense. And when, in order to verify this assertion, we turn to the actual rites which the Reformers devised for Anglican ordination, and recollect what kind of Bishops and priests they were that the Reformed Ordinal produced in the sixteenth century, we find that impression confirmed which a glance at its origin had suggested. It is not easy to see in what, save in name and in subordination to a Bishop, the Protestant priest of Elizabeth's days differed from the foreign Protestant pastor. And even the name, if ever it was applied to him at all, did not bear its ancient sense. No one regarded as sacrificing priests those whom

the Elizabethan Bishops ordained ; nor did they themselves desire that they should be so regarded. Between them and the "seminary priests" there was a clear and broad distinction, which all men, learned or simple, admitted without hesitation. It was no mere question between a corrupt and a purified Catholicism, as High Churchmen would now have us believe ; the two Ministries stood on wholly distinct platforms, and each party, as we shall see later, repudiated with contempt the very Orders of their opponents. We have here pretty clear evidence of a substantial change made in the idea of the Priesthood by the Reformed Church of England.

Returning, however, to the task of ascertaining what omissions or what alterations must be held to vitiate the act of ordination, we observe that the Sacrament of Holy Order (for we assume that those whom this Essay chiefly concerns admit it to be a true Sacrament), though instituted by Christ, was not, so far as we can learn from the Gospel narrative, made by him to depend on any one outward and visible sign, or on any one form of words. That is to say, the regulation of its matter and form appear to have been left to the Church. The fact that the Apostles at once used imposition of hands in conferring ordination suggests, no doubt, that they had learned this outward act from Christ. But not even does the ordination of the Apostles themselves furnish precedents, anyhow not such as the Church has uniformly followed. They appear to have received a commission to baptise at an early period of our Lord's ministry. Power to consecrate and offer the Holy Sacrifice was given to them at its institution, with the words, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* ; and thus they were invested with the Christian *Sacerdotium*. But we cannot fix on any outward act that we might call the "matter" of this ordina-

tion. Again, after the Resurrection, the words, *Accipite Spiritum Sanctum*, &c., indicated the absolving power ; but here also the outward act of breathing has not been adopted by the Church, but only by some obscure Eastern sects ; and theologians do not hold that it was at this time, but earlier, that sacerdotal character was imparted to the Apostles. Once more, just before the Ascension, they received the command to preach, reiterated together with the commission to baptise ; and finally, at Pentecost, the visible descent of the Holy Spirit was their public consecration and mission, and enabled them freely to exercise those various powers which had already been in detail conferred.

Thus it appears that the practice of the Church is our only safe guide as to the essentials of a valid ordination. No one can securely depart from her guidance, and insist, without her authority, that such and such words of our Lord must be regarded as the essential form, and the imposition of hands as the essential matter, when we do not even know for certain that this last was of divine institution. If we disregard the practice of the Church, and maintain that we must not go beyond the letter of the Gospel narrative when we seek to ascertain the primitive rite of ordination as instituted by Christ himself, it is by no means clear that we should be able to insist upon the necessity of Episcopal ordination, as distinct from Presbyterian, at all. And those who accept the doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice might be led to conclude that the most Scriptural mode of ordaining priests would have been for the celebrant at Mass to have placed the sacred Host and the consecrated chalice in the hands of the ordinands, using meanwhile some such form as, *Hoc facite in commemorationem Domini nostri Jesu Christi*. And had such a rite been handed down by tradition

from Apostolic times in any part of the Church, it would doubtless have been allowed as valid where it was in use ; for power to discharge the main priestly function, the offering of the Sacrifice, would thus have been distinctly granted, and the others, at least *in potentia*, would necessarily have been included under it.

But, in addition to the impossibility of ascertaining the divinely ordained matter and form of the Sacrament of Holy Order, a further difficulty in ascertaining what the Church herself regards as essential lies in the facts that, while she is liberal in judging the traditional Oriental rites, she is strict in exacting conformity to those which she authorises her own children to use ; and that, moreover, these very rites are not precisely what they were a thousand years ago.

In view, then, of this further difficulty, how are we to defend the Church against the charge of inconsistency, when we find that in the opinion of her enemies she is open to an accusation of laxity on account of her easy recognition of the validity of Orders in the East, while the very opposite charge of undue severity can with equal justice be brought against her in regard to her strict requirements in the West ? How comes it that a Catholic Bishop would now perhaps invalidate his act, if, influenced by an heretical intention, he ordained a priest with the old Latin rite, precisely as it was used by St. Gregory the Great, or with the rite of some Greek community, which at the very same moment a Greek Bishop might be validly employing in its native home ? * Since the Sacrament of Holy Order is essentially one and the same

* It should be observed that it is not *certain* that such ordinations would be invalid at the hands of a Latin Bishop. They would be only unsafe. But in the administration of the Sacraments the safer course is to be followed. Hence the restrictions referred to have to do with practice.

throughout all the Church, and through all the Church's history, how are such restrictions and such relaxations reconcilable the one with the other ?

Lacroix, a distinguished Jesuit theologian, who lectured chiefly at Cologne in the later years of the seventeenth century, has noticed the question ; and, after laying down the principle already noted, that Christ having only instituted the matter and form of ordination *in genere*, their further determination is left to the Church, he proceeds to point out that, while the use of *signa et verba repræsentiva potestatis conferendæ* is essential, yet that the same ceremonies may mean more under certain circumstances than they do under others ; while, on the other hand, there are some which have a certain significance to minds cast in a certain mould, but yet have quite another significance to those cast in another.* He notices the uncovering of the head as a sign of respect in Europe, and of contempt in Asia. Similarly, an ordination rite that might appear to lack expressiveness, and therefore force, if placed in juxtaposition with the picturesque ceremonial of Rome, may well be, where its use is sanctioned by immemorial tradition, as significant to grave and reserved Orientals as the Western rites are to ourselves, and so may be equally the vehicle for an orthodox intention, and secure the validity of the sacramental act ; whereas, apart from its proper associations, it would be in danger of being deprived of its significance, and so of its force ; as it almost certainly would be if it were of set purpose divorced from those associations, as being mere corruptions not necessarily involved in its use.

And as to the respect with which the Oriental rites are

* Lacroix, "De Sacramentis," lib. vi. pars i. § 16, and pars ii. §§ 2131-2136.

treated, it must also be borne in mind that the almost Apostolic origin of some of them gives them a venerable character, and forbids their being lightly condemned or set aside ; whereas no newly-devised Ordinal, however orthodox in tone, could reasonably put forth a claim to be treated with such consideration. Indeed it may be doubted whether any such production could be safely used by a local Church ; for Durandus and others are referred to as questioning whether *Ecclesia jam adulta* can any longer change or curtail her developed rites. And this epithet, as applied to the living Church, is sufficient to explain her inability now to use with safety the rites which sufficed for her earlier years. A man does not forfeit his identity with his former self in boyhood if he can no longer wear the clothes that suited him then ; nor can he be justly called upon to recognise as a brother an automaton which those clothes have been borrowed to deck.

Thus much, then, may be said as to the teaching of the theologians who hold that the authorised practice of the Church can only be departed from with the gravest peril ; and that what sufficed or suffices at another time or place cannot with safety be brought into use now and here. This opinion appears to the writer eminently reasonable, and it is a doctrine against which Anglican Orders cannot stand. But it is right to add that other theologians are of opinion that what suffices anywhere must be allowed as sufficient everywhere, though not necessarily lawful ; and this view we are willing for the sake of argument to entertain ; and our contention will be that no real precedent for the validity of the Anglican form of ordination can be found.

§ 22. *Application of the above Principles to the Anglican Ordinal.*

Proceeding then to apply to the matter in hand the principles we have just accepted, which allow that very considerable changes may be made in the Church's rites without nullifying the acts, and that matter and form anywhere and at any time admitted to be or to have been sufficient, must be equally admitted everywhere, provided that they are really the same, we observe that the upholders of the Anglican claim have commonly responded to objections against the poverty of matter and form in their Ordinal, by adducing actual examples of these ancient or Eastern methods of ordination, which we have allowed as valid in their own time or place, while they must be admitted to be meagre when compared with the rites contained in the Roman Pontifical. They have also referred to passages in Catholic theologians, where the essentials of Holy Order are restricted to something not unlike what the Anglican Church employs. A few general remarks may be made on the pertinence of this reply.

A Catholic may readily grant that the Prayer-Book Ordinal as it now stands, if not as it stood in Queen Elizabeth's days, employs matter and form in themselves so far sufficiently definite, that if it had come down from a remote antiquity in a community that had continuously preserved, albeit in an undeveloped form, the true Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Order, and on the Sacrifice of the Mass, there would probably have been no difficulty in obtaining from Rome a decision favourable to the validity of the Orders conferred by its use. Where an orthodox tradition has preserved a right

intention, a very meagre form may suffice ; as is clear from the recognition which the Church has never withheld from Oriental and other kindred rites. Anglicans, perhaps not unnaturally, take it as a grievance that these rites should be accepted, and their own rejected ; and they hold that it is an unworthy jealousy, or a foolish loyalty to a mistaken tradition, which makes Catholics unfair in weighing the claims they prefer. But all this is a mistake. Catholics have no cause to be jealous of the Church of England ; nor would they lose anything by recognising its Orders. Rather they would be the gainers ; for a good number of High Church clergymen would be sure to submit to Rome, if they could enter the Church as priests, and act at once as such ; and it is likely enough that they would bring with them not a few of their people, who had learned to value their ministrations ; for of these, now rendered legitimate, they would, under such circumstances, be less likely to be deprived than they actually are now, through the non-recognition of Anglican Orders ; and certainly it would be to the advantage of the Church to be able thus easily to add to the too scanty ranks of her clergy, a number of zealous men, gentlemen by birth and education, many of them moreover possessed of such private means as would enable them to do her work in districts too poor to maintain a priest. It is therefore a purely gratuitous assumption to suppose that Catholics, out of mere spite, prefer the semi-barbarous Abyssinian clergy, to men who, if they could at once become Catholic priests, would certainly do no little credit to the Catholic Church in England. We affirm then positively, that it is nothing but their intimate persuasion that Anglican Orders are null, which predisposes Catholics to judge unfavourably the Anglican ordination rites ; and this persuasion, we also venture to affirm, though it may be mainly based on

a fidelity to an unbroken tradition, is continually being strengthened by the non-appearance of any sufficient defence of Anglican Orders, as being valid in the Catholic sense, coupled with the fact that the more the question is studied the less possible does any such defence appear. For in truth they who draw a parallel between the Anglican ordination rites and those of the East to which reference has been made, forget the essential difference between a form that has remained undeveloped in consequence of its having been in early times cut off from participation in that vigorous life which is characteristic of the Roman Church, and another which has become what it is through a wilful abandonment of the known truth, after this development had been fully accomplished. There may be a specious similarity between the two ; but the underlying difference is everything. Other Anglican characteristics, of which the same account must be given, have already been noted ; and they pointed us to the conclusion that, so far as the possession of sacramental Orders is concerned, Anglicanism is not the budding bough, but the branch that has been cut off and withered. And this view is supported by history.

The Catholic doctrine concerning the Sacrament of Holy Order, and all that Holy Order involves, had been taught and believed in England for near upon a thousand years. Towards the close of this long period Wicklyffe, among other heretical propositions, denied the sacerdotal character of the Christian Ministry. His views flickered on among the Lollards, and were adopted both by the English and foreign Reformers. That the Reformation was a violent outburst of anti-sacerdotalism is a fact that no one will venture to deny. And it was so in England as well as abroad, in spite of that half-conservative policy, which, with the hope of making the English religion co-extensive

with the English nation, induced first Cranmer and his associates, and then Elizabeth and her advisers, to retain some fragments of the old liturgical system and phraseology. The truth of this assertion will be admitted by those who have read the history of the Reformation in England down to the time of its consolidation in the Anglican system ; and it might be illustrated by pages upon pages of quotations from the works of those who took part in the movement. Any one who is disposed to doubt it may convince himself of its truth by a perusal, if he have the patience, of the publications of the "Parker Society." He will gain but a false impression of the character of Anglicanism if he reads no Anglican divine save such as are honoured with a place in the "Anglo-Catholic Library." That semi-sacerdotal notions temporarily asserted themselves in the Church of England in the seventeenth century has already been fully admitted ; but our concern is now with the Elizabethan period, with the view of ascertaining what meaning is to be attached to the attenuated matter and form, which the compilers of the Anglican Ordinal thought fit to employ.

The writer in the American *Catholic World* already referred to, may here be quoted very much to the purpose :— " So far as the material words of the Edwardine forms go, they are sufficient ;—*i.e.*, they are words capable of being used in a sense in which they would be sufficient ; but the words are ambiguous. The form of ordination, although it need not express, must signify or mean the essential idea of the Order. Where it does not carry its meaning on the face of it, we must look for it in the rite and liturgy of which it forms a part. This is not an appeal to the mere subjective intention of the minister, but to the objective meaning of the words. Upon this principle we must, in order to get at the value of the

Anglican forms, discover, 1st, by an examination of the various admittedly valid rites of ordination, what such words should mean ; and 2nd, by an examination of the Anglican rite, what these words in the position which they occupy in that rite, do or do not mean. Canon Estcourt examines the numerous rites which the Roman Church acknowledges to be valid, whether fallen out of use and only to be found in the pages of ancient Sacramentaries, or still living and operative in East or West among Catholics, or among those who have separated from Catholic unity. He finds three qualities in which they all unite : 1st, a recognition of the divine vocation or election of the ordained ; 2nd, a recognition of the *virtus sacramentalis* of Orders, as something quite distinct from and beyond the grace which is also given to the ordained to acquit himself worthily in the duties of his calling ; 3rd, a constant recognition of and appeal to the main scope and duty of Orders,—the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. Canon Estcourt next proceeds to examine the Anglican liturgy and Ordinal with special reference to these three points : 1, the divine election, 2, the sacramental virtue, and 3, the Holy Sacrifice. And he finds that both the liturgy and the Ordinal are the result of a deliberate manipulation of the ancient Catholic ritual previously in use, in order to the exclusion of these three points, which contain the essential idea of Holy Orders. Ordination in the Anglican ritual no longer appeals to a divine election of which it is the expression and the fulfilment. It is merely the public expression of the approval of the authorities of Church and State.* For the *virtus sacramentalis* it has sub-

* The present writer is not disposed to admit that the divine vocation is excluded from the Anglican idea of ordination. No doubt, as Canon Estcourt points out (pp. 210, *sqq.*), ancient expressions have been omitted and new ones introduced, apparently with the view of favouring the Lutheran doctrine

stituted a mere *grace d'état*. From this it only naturally follows that Episcopal ordination cannot be of indispensable necessity, or more than a matter of regulation and propriety, which in an emergency may be abrogated. This is the express teaching of many of the early Anglican Reformers. Even when engaged in defending their Episcopal succession, they are careful to say that they do not regard it as indispensable. Hooker, who is in many respects so much more orthodox than his predecessors and contemporaries, allows "that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination to be made without a Bishop." *

"Canon Estcourt prints considerable portions of the Anglican Ordinal and liturgy in parallel columns with the corresponding text of the Sarum and Exeter Pontificals and Missals. We see with what an unerring sacrilegious instinct everything bearing upon the Holy Sacrifice, and even upon the Real Presence, is either cut out or perverted. . . . Had these alterations been merely the result of an antiquarian leaning towards a more primitive, though less perfect utterance of the same truth, or of a Puritanic craving after simplicity, the irreverence would have been of the extremest kind ; but still there would have been no

of a "call" from the people. But the Anglican rite is more than a mere "recognition service." It is a formal "admission" to an office, with a solemn benediction of the persons admitted. And there are distinct references to an interior divine vocation ; though the service also goes half-way towards the admission of the doctrine of the necessity of a popular vocation. But the two other points, the sacramental bestowal of spiritual power, and the recognition of the Sacrifice as the main object of ordination, are more important ; and Anglican Orders stand or fall with the possibility of their being maintained.

* That an Episcopal succession is not *de esse*, but merely *de benè esse* of "a Church" is a view that has been continuously held by some of the most eminent Anglican divines ; and it is maintained by several Anglican Bishops of to-day. And in truth Episcopal succession is not of the essence of the Church, but it is nevertheless an inseparable accident.

grounds for disputing the orthodox sense, and so the validity of the form. But, on the contrary, the very object of the alterations was the elimination of the orthodox doctrines of Priesthood and Sacrifice, and therefore of the significance upon which the validity of the form depends. . . . It is true that originally different portions of the Church were allowed, in regard to Orders, to give expression to the same truth with various degrees of explicitness ; but this can afford no precedent to an individual Church for mutilating a common form in order to deny a common truth." *

Those who will study this admirable and lucid statement of Canon Estcourt's argument, and who are able to appreciate the justice of the principle which underlies its reasoning, will need nothing further to convince them of the irrelevance of Anglican appeals to the *dicta* of Catholic theologians, who speculatively place the essential matter of priestly ordination in the imposition of hands, without insisting on any further ceremony to indicate the significance of the act,—and to a single decision of one of the Roman Congregations, which admits the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* as, under certain circumstances, a sufficient form. This latter point will be treated at length in a section below ; and as to the former, it must suffice here to note that the theologians whom Anglicans quote do not contemplate in their speculations such circumstances as those of the Elizabethan ordinations. They had in view Catholic ordinations, or at least an orthodox tradition ; whereas the question of Anglican ordinations has to do, not merely with simplicity or silence, but with deliberate and heretical exclusion of truths that had long been known and received.

* "Catholic World," vol. xix. pp. 613-616.

§ 23. *The Question of Sufficient Intention.*

We will suppose, however, that the champion of Anglican Orders is content with the admission that the Edwardine rites, as they stood in the Prayer-book until 1662, contain matter and form capable of being so used as to confer valid Orders. He is next confronted with Catholic criticism of the intention with which those rites were used ; and in reply he appeals once more to his chips from Catholic theology, and maintains that a general intention of doing what the Church does suffices, and that a Bishop who has this, and who uses rites sufficient in themselves, really ordains and consecrates, though he be at the time a schismatic, a heretic, or indeed even an infidel. Now the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal seems to secure this sufficient general intention, and no one pretends that Anglican Bishops have been worse than heretical ; *ergo*, Catholics are precluded from questioning Anglican Orders on the ground of intention. The argument seems good, and deserves consideration.

We have already distinguished above between the public official intention, which authorises and approves an act, and the private intention of the agent, which accompanies its performance. This latter, in the case of the Elizabethan ordinations, we do not propose to call in question, so far as it stands alone. It is at all times rather a matter for the confessional than for exterior criticism ; still less can it be investigated to any purpose in the case of men who have been dead some three hundred years. Their private opinions at the moment of consecrating Parker or of ordaining Whitgift cannot now be ascertained ; nor are they of any real importance to our discussion, save in so

far as this, that their action in the matter shows that they conformed those opinions to the significant public intention contained in the fact of the compilation, production and enforcement of the Anglican Ordinal. In this section therefore our contention will be, that the teaching of the Church on what constitutes a sufficient interior intention is irrelevant to the case of the early Anglican ordinations ; though, in illustrating the Catholic doctrine, we shall have occasion to show, that even in their private intentions, if we could know of them apart from the public significance of their acts, the Elizabethan Bishops probably came perilously near the frustration of sacramental rites, had those that they used been such.

Now the Anglican Reformers, in consequence of their Protestant estimate of the nature of Sacraments, were freed from the necessity of holding any doctrine whatever on the intention of the administrator. He had little or nothing to do with the virtue of the Sacraments, which depended wholly on the faith of the recipient. To the "faithful" only were they "effectual signs of grace:" and accordingly, as the Catholic doctrines concerning them were more and more forgotten, the receiving of the communion (the only Sacrament left to the adult Protestant), came to be regarded as little else than a solemn opportunity for making an act of justifying faith. Obviously, when Sacraments are thus estimated, the intention of the minister has nothing whatever to do with their validity, and so not even a *minimum* need be insisted upon.

A hazy tradition of some such view as this seems to have predisposed Anglicans to make light of the necessity of any due intention in the minister at all ; even now that they have accepted something very like the Catholic doctrine of the Sacraments, which makes them to be substantial in themselves, and not merely dependent on the

faith of the recipient.* And so, when they have to face the question of the intention with which the Elizabethan Bishops ordained priests, or with which Low Churchmen in our own day baptise and "take the Communion Service," they find, or profess to find, no serious difficulty in accepting an extremely lax doctrine, such as practically reduces the Sacraments to the level of merely mechanical processes, in which words and acts would have a power of their own, not merely apart from, but even in opposition to, the will of the agent. The acts in question were effected willy-nilly. Parker and his fellow-Bishops could not help ordaining sacrificing priests; and Low Church clergymen cannot avoid regenerating infants in baptism, if only they made and make use of the letter of the rites which the Prayer-book provides. Such a doctrine as this is really extravagant, and is not the same as that *minimum* of intention with which theologians are satisfied.

It is true that, in regard to the interior intention of the administrator, the Church only demands that it shall be generally to do what the Church does, or what Christ instituted. It is true moreover that "the Church" need not here mean "the Roman Church," or "the Catholic Church," but merely "the Church" in general; so that, if

* The writer in the *Church Quarterly* must, however, be excepted from this category. He proposes a doctrine of intention which is in fact that of Catholics, save that it is somewhat differently expressed:—"The Lord has given all his gifts and instructions to reasoning beings, and not to machines. And it would be formal and mechanical in the extreme to contend that the mere doing of a certain act made a priest, unless some words at the same time expressed a sense of what a priest is, and how he is made, and an intention of using the action with this sense and meaning. This is but the same principle which prevails in arranging all the forms of procedure in State affairs, and in the law. Following out the same line of thought we are bound to allow that words which constitute a valid form when used in a certain sense, may yet be invalid if used in a different sense." Did this writer really accept the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood, he would find that by these admissions he had cut away the ground from his feet.

the minister believes his own heretical sect to be the true Church, such an error would not necessarily invalidate his intention. These concessions seem to Anglicans exactly to meet their wants. "Although it is certainly true," they may say, "that the Elizabethan Bishops did not believe as we do in the Church, and had no intention to ordain sacrificing priests, yet they intended to ordain such ministers as Christ had instituted for his Church, and so their general intention was good."

It may be admitted that in itself it was good, and that it would have been sufficient, had it stood alone. But our contention is that in fact it was hindered from becoming operative through being subordinated to their public and official intention, which practically contradicted and frustrated it. This position needs exposition and illustration.

First it may be pointed out that the theologians referred to as admitting the sufficiency of the intention of Protestant ministers, had in view their administration of baptism, in which they employ, with a general intention to do what Christ instituted, matter and form of distinctly divine appointment. Anxious to extend as widely as possible the principle laid down by the Council of Trent, in order to secure the blessings of Christian baptism to the greatest possible number, they have used language which is not strictly applicable to the transmission into an heretical and schismatical community of the powers and privileges of the Christian Priesthood; and that with the result that the most sacred mysteries which the Priesthood involves should be habitually neglected or profaned. What they had in view when they employed the expressions that are quoted, is thus not really parallel with the case of Anglican ordinations.

Secondly, it should be observed that, when in other

passages they speak particularly of ordinations which are to be accounted valid, even when given by Bishops who had lapsed into heresy on the doctrine of Holy Order, or were sceptical as to its reality, they are contemplating the case of Bishops using the Catholic rite with heretical intention, and not the case of heretical Bishops using a rite that had been deliberately mutilated, or newly compiled, in order to give expression to their erroneous views. In other words, their language applies to Cranmer's consecrations during the latter half of Henry's reign, but not to those which he performed with the Reformed Ordinal. There is a clear distinction between the two. In the latter case the ritual has been altered *de industria* in order to give an heretical intention effect; in the former, according to Perrone,* who refers to St. Thomas, since the administrator ostensibly acts in the name of the Church, and, as her representative, uses the form and matter by which her intention is expressed, this would suffice to effect the Sacrament. For in this case, since he subordinates his interior intention to the public and official intention of the Church, as expressed by her significant ritual, *intentio generalis, quâ vult quod Christus instituit, prævalet intentioni provenienti ex errore privato.*†

The principle here indicated, of the prevalence of the stronger over the weaker intention, really seems to explain all the difficulties in which some aspects of the doctrine of intention are undoubtedly involved. And, generally speaking, the stronger intention would be that which manifests itself in the outward act, whether that act be in

* "De Sacramentis in Genere," § 166.

† Busembaum, "Medulla," Lib. vi. Tract I. cap. 2, § 1. He is speaking, however, not of ordinations, but of baptisms and marriages performed by Protestant ministers, the validity of which is independent of all question of Orders.

accordance with the established usage, or, as in the case of Anglican ordinations, be a departure from it. But we must proceed to illustrate the Catholic doctrine of the necessity of a due interior intention, for unless that is understood and accepted, there is no real basis on which we can discuss questions of intention at all.

Were it not for the controversial exigencies of their position, probably no Anglicans would hesitate to accept, as indeed they do not now deny the justice of, the teaching of the Church, which is the teaching of common sense as well, that the absence of any serious intention at all, such as would render the administration of a Sacrament not what theologians call an *actus humanus*, i.e., not the act of a reasonable being, would invalidate its efficacy. This would probably apply to the case of an ordination performed in jest ; and certainly to cases where the Bishop was mad, drunk, or dreaming. On such grounds Novatian's Episcopal consecration was rejected, the Bishops who performed the ceremony being described as *temulenti*.

So again Anglicans would probably allow, what all theologians teach with but few exceptions, and they only in reference to baptism, that if the minister deliberately withholds his intention, and resolves, though performing the external rites, not to confer the grace which the Church by that Sacrament confers, he frustrates the validity of his act.*

* Pope Alexander VIII. condemned the proposition that a minister would validly baptise, who, though using the whole of the prescribed ceremonies, should inwardly resolve not to do by that Sacrament what the Church does. And Cardinal Franzelin ("De Sac. in Gen.," Thesis xvii.) refers to decisions of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, given in 1586 and 1682, which condemned as null, solely on account of an explicit reservation of intention on the part of the Bishop, ordinations performed with the solemn rites of the Church. He had stated that he should not intend to ordain those candidates who presented themselves to him in spite of certain disqualifications.

Now no one maintains that any of the above cases, wherein lack of sufficient interior intention nullifies the Sacrament, is precisely that of Anglican ordinations ; though it would not be hard to show that the last is in some measure parallel. We proceed, therefore, to notice other grades of intention falling short of the highest and best, but yet not simply condemnatory of the act they accompany ; and then we shall refer to some which must be regarded as so far doubtful, that in practice they could not be held to suffice.

Suppose that while conferring Orders the Bishop were to become "absent," and proceed with the ceremony mechanically. Still he would validly ordain ; for the due intention with which he began would virtually continue, and would be further secured by the form and matter of the Church's rites.

Or again, if he were a schismatic, or a heretic, or were indifferent about revealed truth as a whole, or were even secretly an atheist, still, if he used a rite of acknowledged validity, and, so far from deliberately resolving not to confer the Sacrament, had a general though feeble intention of giving to the ordinands what they came to him to receive, he would really ordain, though he might himself have no serious belief in the substantial nature of his act. There is no evidence that such a case as this last has ever actually occurred ; but theologians have speculatively admitted that it is to be held sufficient, perhaps by way of illustrating the goodness of God in not suffering the sin of man to hinder the free flow of grace within his Church.*

* Anglicans have referred to Prince Talleyrand, the apostate Bishop of Autun, as an example of an atheist consecrator, the validity of whose acts was recognised ; and they use this recognition as an argument against the rejection of the intention of the Elizabethan Bishops. But it will be seen that the cases are not parallel. Nor is it clear that Talleyrand, at the time

But we turn now from these positive and sufficient intentions, which may vary from the most complete to one barely short of indifference, and we will consider what seem to belong to a distinct class.

A Catholic Bishop, let us suppose, mimics on the stage the ordination of a priest, minutely following every detail of the rite as contained in the Roman Pontifical. Theologians unanimously teach that the act would be absolutely null, and right reason supports their decision.* But on what grounds is it based? In a certain sense he may be said to have "intended to do what the Church does;" but this intention, such as it was, was frustrated before it could become operative, by the far more vigorous public intention which he had of turning the ceremony into a profane jest. No one, however, would attempt to place the intention with which Anglican Bishops have ordained in the same category as this.

Another example of defective intention may be adduced: A Catholic priest goes up to the altar, apparently intending to say Mass. But he makes (we will suppose)

that he consecrated the "constitutional Bishops," had lapsed from the faith so far as he certainly did later. Moreover, the intention of those consecrations was distinctly to produce Bishops in the Catholic sense, who should differ from the Catholic Episcopate only in their recognition of the "civil constitution of the clergy." They were to be *Summi Sacerdotes*, sacrificers of the Mass, none the less.

* On the other side, however, is sometimes urged the well-known story of the child whom St. Athanasius when a child baptised at play, the validity of the act being admitted by Alexander, then Bishop of Alexandria. But here again the cases are not really parallel. Those who know anything of children's play, know with what sober seriousness such acts as "playing at school" or "playing at priests" are performed. The intention to make fun of what is done is in fact subordinated to the intention actually to do, as far as may be, what is imitated. And so this case may really be taken as a further illustration of the weak intention being overcome by the strong. Perrone ("De Sac. in Gen.," § 155) gives a similar explanation:—"Alexander deprehendit in Athanasio animum imitandi, adeoque et faciendi, quod in Ecclesiâ fieri vidit." But anyhow an anecdote, however pleasing and well-attested (and this one is called in question), cannot set aside the unanimous teaching of theologians.

a strong and deliberate intention not to sacrifice, since he has secretly lapsed into heresy, and is profoundly convinced that sacrifice formed no part of Christ's original institution. Under such circumstances, though he performed all the outward acts, it is doubtful whether his consecration would be valid, and so whether he would really celebrate the Eucharist at all.

Again, a Bishop (we will suppose) before proceeding to ordain priests, calls the candidates to him, and tells them that he will withhold his intention to confer on them the power to forgive sins, although (out of human respect) he will use the prescribed words; for he is persuaded that such power was never really entrusted to men. Probably such an ordination would be held so far doubtful as to need repetition *sub conditione*; though it might, on the other hand, be maintained that in the Catholic rite the ordination is complete before the form which expresses the remission of sins is used.

Now what is the principle which thus renders uncertain Sacraments administered with the full rites of the Church, and apparently with a generally good intention of doing what Christ instituted? It appears to be that which is thus stated by Vasquez, a famous Jesuit theologian:—*Oportet ut Sacramentum, quod ex diversis finibus ministrari potest, determinetur ex intentione ministri ad sacramentalem effectum. . . . Prava intentio, quæ adversatur fini ipsius Sacramenti, . . . tollit et impedit essentiam Sacramenti.** On this principle, even when interior intention alone is taken into consideration, a real distinction can be drawn between such as is imperfect and yet sufficient (since it has nothing in view but the doing of what the Church does), and such as is, on the other hand, per-

* Vasquez, "Disputationes in Summa S. Thomæ," tom. ii. quæst. lxiv. art. 3.

verted and contradictory, inconsistent with an implicit acceptance of the Church's faith, hostile to the end to which the Sacrament was actually ordained, and so not unlikely to nullify the act of a minister who is thus minded.

And, as a kind of corollary to this principle, it may be pointed out that, if a man makes his intention to do what the Church does depend on the Church not really giving by that Sacrament what she actually does give ; if, in other words, he subordinates his generally good intention to his perverse heretical intention, there would be a danger of the rite being frustrated. Of course it might be said that the heretical intention would in all cases be subordinated to the intention to do, if not what the Church does, at least what Christ instituted, and that this must be allowed to suffice. But it is by no means clear that, in the case, for example, of the Elizabethan Bishops, their anti-Catholic convictions were not so much stronger than their hold on Christian dogma, that had it been demonstrated to them that the Priesthood in the Catholic sense was in truth the institution of Christ, they would have renounced Christianity rather than have given men the power of saying Mass. And if this be so, it would follow that, even had they used the rites in the Roman Pontifical, and had been true Bishops themselves, they would have been exposed to a danger of frustrating the validity of their acts through their strong intention not to confer a sacrificial Priesthood ; whereas a mere sceptic, who through kindness and an anxiety to oblige, might have been induced to baptise, would be less likely thus to invalidate the Sacrament, though he might all the while regard the ceremony with indifference. But this is stated only as suggestive, and not as the real grounds on which Anglican ordinations are rejected.

Moreover, in addition to the due intention on the part

of the administrator, there must also be a due intention on the part of the recipient. He need not have full knowledge of the powers which the Order he is receiving confers upon him ; he need not even believe in them ; but he must have at least the will to receive the Order, with all its powers, whatever they may be ; and if the will to receive it be made to depend on its not being what in fact it is, there is some probability that such a reserved intention would constitute an *obex*, frustrating the Sacrament. All theologians agree that Orders conferred on unwilling subjects are invalid ; and Benedict XIV., teaching, as he expressly states, as a private doctor, thought that an indifferent intention—*i.e.*, where the candidate neither consented nor dissented, but merely permitted the ceremony to take place, would invalidate the rite.

Obviously this requirement indicates another weakness in the Anglican claim ; for even in the present day Low Church deacons distinctly intend not to be ordained sacrificing and absolving priests ; and the primitive Anglican ministers of Parker's ordination knew well enough what a " Mass-priest " was, loathed the very notion of his office, and would have died rather than have had it conferred upon themselves. Nor were they imprudent in such a resolve ; for they would have been in danger of death had they in fact received it, since to have been ordained a Catholic priest was for years a capital crime in England.*

* It may be well to add, by way of anticipating an obvious retort, that this doctrine of the invalidity of Orders conferred upon reluctant candidates, has no relevance to the cases, whether in early, mediæval, or modern times, of priests or Bishops ordained or consecrated, as is recorded in their lives, in obedience to the directions of superiors and against their own decided protest. If they carried their unwillingness into the actual ceremony itself they would of course frustrate the act, and indeed would commit mortal sin. Should the Bishop-elect persist in his *nolo episcopari* on the morning of his consecration, the rite could not proceed. But the humility of these men, which alone prompted their resistance, would bow before their recognition of the will of God ; and having once made their submission, they would receive the Order with the most perfect good will.

It would appear, then, that if we have correctly estimated the attitude towards the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood, which was formerly the rule in the Church of England, Anglican Orders are at least questionable simply on the ground of perverted interior intention, without any reference to the rite employed. But it is the fact that the heretical intention has taken effect on the rite itself which constitutes the serious objection. Let us add one more illustration to those that have been given above :— Before the ordination begins, the Bishop and the ordinands explicitly profess their disbelief in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and they sign a document wherein it is described as “ a blasphemous fable, and a dangerous deceit.” The service then proceeds, and the administrator omits all the matter and form that would not harmonise with the declaration they have made, and mentally interprets all the ambiguous language of the rite in a sense conformable with the heresy which he and his candidates have embraced. We have imagined a grotesque and scandalous case, such as would be practically impossible within the Catholic Church ; yet what is it but an account of the early Anglican ordinations ? And what would theologians say as to the effect of so depraved an intention as this, which, finding itself inconsistent with the teaching of the Church, maims and mangles the Catholic ritual in order to bring it into conformity with itself ?

As, then, in the preceding section it was urged that matter and form, capable of being so used as to be sufficient, cannot under all circumstances be depended upon as effectual ; so here it is submitted that a general intention, good as far as it goes, cannot with safety be reckoned upon as operative, if there is reason to suppose that it has been crossed and perverted in practice by something stronger than itself. And especially we contend that when these two uncertainties coalesce, as they surely do

in the proceedings of the Anglican Reformers, *i.e.*, when, in obedience to an heretical intention, matter and form are attenuated to a perilous *minimum*, so that the depraved intention becomes in fact public, official, and significant, a moral conviction of the untrustworthiness of the act is produced, which other evidence confirms.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

I.

§ 24. *The Catholic Doctrine of the Christian Priesthood.*

BUT it may be objected that we have not yet proved that on which the whole force of our argument depends—viz., the rejection by the Church of England, in the sixteenth century, of the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood. It may be urged that, by retaining certain expressions and certain practices which the foreign Protestants rejected, the Anglican Church manifested and secured her intention to retain a sacerdotal Ministry, which the Reformers on the Continent repudiated and lost. Now, if this view can be successfully maintained, it is clear that Catholics cannot reject Anglican Orders on the ground of depraved intention; nor can they contend that the form and matter which the English Reformers employed, were robbed of that significance on which their sufficiency depends.

It is, then, important that we should examine in detail the relation borne by the Anglican Church to the Catholic doctrine of the *Sacerdotium*. The whole question really hinges on this point. The “circumstances” which, as Catholics are convinced, rendered null the original Anglican ordinations, gained their destructive character, if such it was, from the complete rejection by the founders of the Anglican system of the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of the Christian Ministry.* The importance, there-

* The weakness of the argument in the *Church Quarterly*, several times referred to, is very apparent here. While admitting that a form, valid when

fore, of this allegation must excuse the tedious length at which it is discussed, as well as certain inevitable repetitions.

It has already been pointed out that at the Reformation the Church of England sacrilegiously rejected the Minor Orders and the Subdiaconate. The Diaconate was retained, at least nominally; and the question of the validity of the rite used to confer it has been waived, since in any case it cannot be maintained unless the Anglican Church have real Bishops and priests. Here, then, is the real ground of the controversy; and that it may be discussed to some purpose, it will be well to give a brief statement of the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood, which, it should not be forgotten, is, in its main features, as fully accepted in the East as in the West.

According to the teaching of St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and theologians generally, the Priesthood is the highest Order in the Church, and is subdivided into two ranks—the Presbyterate and the Episcopate—which two names denote what is specific to either rank, while what is generic to both is comprised in the term *Sacerdotium*. This Priesthood has two main functions, the one (and

used in one sense, would not be valid when used in another, the writer makes no attempt to show that the sense in which the Anglican form was used is the same as that in which its sufficiency can be admitted by Catholics. On the contrary, he “entirely declines to be led into an argument as to the degree in which the Church of England does or does not agree with the Church of Rome [he might have added, “and with all ‘Churches’ which are known to have preserved the Apostolical Succession”] upon the powers and duties of the Priesthood.” And he refuses to involve himself in “technical questions of theology, such as that of ‘character,’ upon which the broad issue of validity could never be supposed to turn.” The truth is that it is just on this point that the whole question does turn. If Anglican Orders do not confer “character,” they are certainly not valid in the Catholic sense. The writer does not appear to be aware that Hooker actually did claim “character” for the Anglican Ministry; though with him the word seems to have borne another meaning. His claim is, however, a point in favour of the Anglican theory.

that the most important), to consecrate and offer in sacrifice the true Body of Christ ; and the other, to teach, govern, and absolve his mystical Body, the Church. Now, although this twofold order of Priesthood is essentially one, the distinction between the two ranks, which is rather one of authority than of power, has gradually developed itself, and, so to speak, solidified, during the Church's long life ; so that practically and in popular estimation Bishops form an Order quite distinct from priests, though, according to the common teaching of theologians, they do not.* Certain sacerdotal functions are, however, peculiar to the Episcopate, such as Confirmation and Ordination ; and, in regard to these, the Council of Trent teaches that simple priests have no power. Nevertheless it is clear that this reservation is a matter of ecclesiastical discipline rather than of divine institution ; for in certain Episcopal acts (*e.g.*, the ordination of priests, and the consecration of the holy oils), priests may and do assist, and, under special circumstances, they may, by permission of the Pope, give Confirmation and the Minor Orders.† The plenitude of power thus possessed by the Church in regulating the distinctive functions of Bishop and priest, a power such that it actually invalidates an irregular attempt on the part of a priest to

* Bellarmine, Tournely, and a few others, actually do make the Episcopate a distinct Order from the Presbyterate, on the ground that therein is conferred a special character, and a new relation towards the Holy Eucharist—viz., the power to ordain ministers for its celebration. If this view be accepted, the Catholic Church has eight and not seven Orders. But all admit that the relation of the one to the other corresponds to the relation between Baptism and Confirmation, the former containing what is essential, while the latter is its completion and crown.

† Perrone ("Tract. de Ordine," § 134) says that a priest may, by the Pope's delegation, ordain subdeacons. Whether he may under similar circumstances confer the Diaconate is disputed ; and the genuineness of a privilege to that effect alleged to have been granted by Innocent VIII. to five Cistercian Abbots is called in question.

discharge sacerdotal functions which the Church has reserved to the Episcopate, should be carefully noted. It suggests that, so soon as the Reformers had decided to prefer their own private interpretation of Scripture to the tradition of the Church, they ran a serious risk of forfeiting the possession of the Church's Ministry. Indeed, as has already been suggested, if the bare letter of Scripture be appealed to, while this tradition is set aside, it is by no means clear that a Presbyterian succession would not suffice. Priests, according to the Catholic catechism, are "successors of the Apostles" as well as Bishops; and, as is well known, the history of the primitive Church is not free from difficulties for those who insist on the necessity of an Episcopal succession, without admitting the supremacy of the authority of the Church in regulating the Sacrament of Holy Order. It would be beside our purpose to discuss these difficulties here; * what we have now in view is to make clear that the Anglican Reformers, no less than Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli, were fundamentally in error concerning the nature of the Christian Ministry, and differed from them only as to the expedience of retaining certain names; and that moreover, by acting conformably with their erroneous views, the former as well as the latter really failed to retain the Catholic *Sacerdotium*, though they did not abandon the nominal ranks into which that Priesthood is divided.

We take it then for granted by those whom we chiefly address, that Bishops and priests, to be really such, must distinctly be *sacerdotes*. Their principal function is to offer Christ in sacrifice for the living and the dead; and next they have sacramentally to absolve his mystical Body, the

* Perrone, *ubi sup.* §§ 138-151, refers to some of them at length.

Church. Supernatural power to perform such tremendous functions is conferred upon them by the Sacrament of Holy Order. This rite is therefore more than a simple benediction with prayer that they who are ordained may faithfully discharge their duties. Of such a character as this is the Benediction of an Abbot, which, although solemnised by imposition of hands and prayer, together with the delivery of mitre, ring, and pastoral staff, is nevertheless no Sacrament. Much less is Catholic ordination a mere form, such as the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal appears to contemplate, by which men are publicly called, tried, examined, approved, and admitted to an "office" or "administration." The solemn grant of bare external authority, or the formal reception of a commission to preach and administer Sacraments, are ideas of ordination which fall very far short of the Catholic. True ordination is in fact a distinct consecration; it infuses spiritual power into the soul, and imprints upon it an indelible character, by which is produced a certain conformity with, and a participation in, the sacerdotal character of Christ. And all this is in addition to the increase of sanctifying grace, which at the same time the ordinand, in proportion to his merit, may receive; and in addition to the *grace d'état*, or aid for the due discharge of his duties as occasion arises, which at his ordination is impetrated on his behalf. If the rite be not a Sacrament, and confer no *virtus sacramentalis*, such Orders, by whatever name known, have no substantial participation in the Priesthood of divine institution;—in other words, they are not valid.

Such, then, is the belief of Catholics concerning the nature of Holy Order; and such must be also the belief of High Churchmen, if they are consistent in their professions to be in possession of the Catholic Priesthood, in

virtue of which they can say Mass and absolve. Anyhow, such had been the faith of the Catholic Church of England up to the time of the Reformation.

Did the Reformed Church of England retain or even tolerate this, the true doctrine concerning the office and work of a priest in the Church of God? If it did, then the Elizabethan Bishops may well have used the Anglican forms of ordination in that sacramental sense which they are capable of bearing; if not, then the Orders they conferred will not stand the test of Catholic principles.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

II.

§ 25. *The Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.*

What then did the Reformed Church teach as to the principal sacerdotal function, the offering of the Christian Sacrifice? As early as 1548, the "Order of the Communion" showed those who were acquainted with Catholic theology, that the men whose advice in matters of religion the young King Edward was following had abandoned the true doctrine.* Permission to consecrate in one kind is reconcilable with faith in the Real Presence, no doubt, but not with faith in the Sacrifice, since it destroys the integrity of the act; and such permission, or rather such direction, when there was need, the "Order of the Communion" gave.

The Ordinal of Edward VI., even in its first non-Puritan edition, bore the same witness. From first to last it contained not a word implying, even distantly, the sacrificial nature of the office which it committed to "Bishops" or "priests." What makes this all the more noteworthy is the fact that it did retain the external ceremony of delivering to the newly ordained priests the chalice with

* Twelve or fifteen years before the publication of the "Order of the Communion," the Reforming party (not at that time a very numerous one) had really abandoned all distinctively Catholic doctrine concerning the Mass and the Sacraments; but were for the most part unable to give practical expression to their heretical opinions. This fact has an important bearing on Barlow's case, for he was one of the leaders of this party.

the bread ; but to these was now added a Bible ; while, instead of using the old form, "Receive power of offering sacrifices to God," &c. ; the Bishop said, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the holy Sacraments in this Congregation." What was the meaning of this deliberate change, if not to exclude the doctrine of the Sacrifice ?

The First Prayer-book of the same King, by its silence where the Sarum Missal had spoken plainly, amply confirmed the view that the Anglican Reformers had entirely rejected the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass before the close of the first half of the sixteenth century. The name indeed was retained ("The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass"), but evidently only to trick the people into conformity, for the thing itself was gone. And the same account must be given of the retention of the framework of the rite, and of certain ceremonial details. But even here the instinct of heretical selection was manifest. None of the distinctively sacerdotal insignia were named. There was no word about chasuble, or stole, or mitre ; but cope, rochet, pastoral staff, surplice and hood, were all specified. If it be true that "vestment" meant chasuble, still the permission to celebrate in a cope, when every sacristy contained chasubles, showed that belief in the Sacrifice was gone.* And the language of the rite itself bore the same witness. All sacrificial

* The alleged use of the cope as a sacrificial vestment in the Armenian Church is irrelevant here. The shape or colour of the priest's dress has no magical influence over his acts when he offers the Holy Sacrifice. Its significance depends very much on custom ; and it is certain that in England Mass was never said in a cope before the doctrine of the Sacrifice had been abandoned. And it appears that the Armenian "cope" is really the ancient circular chasuble, cut away in front, instead of at the sides, for convenience. For a further discussion of the witness borne by Anglican ritual to the nature of Anglican Orders, see in the Appendix, Note IX, on the "Significance of the Ornaments Rubric."

expressions that the Canon of the Mass had contained, save only such as were literally "Scriptural," and so presumably capable of a Protestant interpretation, had been carefully expunged. The elevation of the Sacrament was forbidden, and the rite at the utmost only professed to be "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;"—an expression which is of course applicable to the Mass in a Catholic sense, though it is in itself ambiguous. And, with a similar intention, the phrase "our bounden duty and service" was appropriated to the "reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice" of "ourselves, our souls and bodies;" whereas in the Missal the words had been applied to the Mass itself. It was however by its silence rather than by its language that the new service betrayed its true character. Placed side by side with the old Ritual, the significance of its omissions becomes clear. Compared with the existing Prayer-book it has no doubt a Catholic flavour; but compared with the Sarum Missal it practically denies that it is a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice of Christ for the living and the dead. And indeed, it is evidence of the weak grasp of Catholic doctrine to which even extreme High Churchmen, in spite of loud professions and showy externals, have as yet attained, that so many of them should covet as a privilege permission to use the Communion Service from the Prayer-book of 1549, seeing that it is a mere caricature of the Mass, a thoroughly Protestant rite, admitting the Real Presence, but denying the Sacrifice, and such as could not possibly be tolerated by the Catholic Church.*

* It is not clear whether Lutheranism, Calvinism, or Zwinglianism had most influence with the English Reformers. Where these three systems accord, Anglicanism is at one with them; but, perhaps in consequence of its having been throughout a political rather than a religious movement, it seems to have avoided their distinctive peculiarities. Edward's First Prayer-book has much

The second edition of Edward's Prayer-book (1552) is repudiated by High Churchmen, on the grounds that Convocation had no voice in its production, and that it was never extensively used. But it was substantially the same as Elizabeth's Prayer-book, and indeed the same as that which the Church of England employs at the present day; for the slight alterations and additions made in 1558, 1604, and 1661, have not changed its essential character.

Taking, however, the Elizabethan edition as that with which we are especially concerned, we observe that we have no need to prove that its Communion service was no true Mass if we have rightly condemned as not being such the service of 1549. Indeed the edition, whether of 1552 or 1558, made no such pretence. Its structure was radically changed, and there was no reference to either altar or oblations, nor to anything suggestive of sacrifice, save only the term "priest." The significance of this word, since it is the mainstay of the Anglican position, will receive fuller consideration later. It is enough here to indicate the Catholic explanation of its retention—viz., that it was simply a political expedient.

The total rejection of the Mass by the Elizabethan Established Church is so patent a fact that it is strange that any serious men should be found to question it. The Queen herself, to whose conservative policy was due the retention of certain Catholic externals, thoroughly

in common with Lutheran formularies, and Article xi. is distinctly Lutheran. Yet other Articles are Calvinistic; and Calvin himself is said to have found the Prayer-book so much to his mind, as to have seen in it nothing worthy of serious condemnation. He complained merely of its *tolerabiles ineptiæ*. Meanwhile Mr. Nicholas Pocock writes to the *Guardian* (July 10th, 1878):—"I have read and considered during the last twenty years most of the printed and many of the MS. sources of information on the subject, and I am quite sure no other view than that Edward's Reformation was conducted on Zwinglian principles can be maintained in the face of historical facts."

repudiated the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice. Even before her coronation she ordered a Bishop, who was about to say Mass in her presence, not to elevate the Host; and as he refused to obey so impious a command, she left the chapel after the Gospel had been read. And all the men who were selected to form the Protestant Hierarchy were Calvinists or Zwinglians, save only Cheney, of Gloucester, who was a Lutheran.* Many of them used the strongest language in condemnation of the Holy Sacrifice; and the clergy they ordained were not slow to follow their example. Quotations might be multiplied indefinitely in illustration of the violent expression in Article XXXI., which declares "the sacrifices of masses" to be "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits."† The assertion that this was a condemnation, not of the Sacrifice of the Mass, but of mediæval corruptions, or of a presumptuous trust in posthumous intercessions, to the neglect of good living, which Catholics of course would also condemn,—has already been shown untenable. Twenty years before this Article was finally put forth for

* The rumour that he died a Catholic has already been referred to. A vigorous but pathetic letter addressed to him by Edmund Campion, the Jesuit martyr, will be found in Mr. Simpson's Biography of the latter, p. 363. They had in former years been friends at College. In this letter Campion complains that Cheney had "falsely usurped the name of a Bishop," and speaks also of the "spurious Orders" which his hands conferred.

† Luther had begun by asserting that the Catholic Priesthood had been "erected by Satan through lies of men." Becon, the friend and adviser of Cranmer, echoed him in England by saying that "the Sacrifice of the Mass came from hell." Grindal, Parker's successor in the See of Canterbury, called the Mass "an accursed abomination and a diabolical profanation of the Lord's Supper." And when Dr. Gregory Martin, of the Catholic College at Douai, had complained that some mistranslations in the Protestant Bibles were intended to weaken the evidence in favour of the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, Dr. Fulke thus replied to him:—"In denying the blasphemous sacrifice of the Popish Mass, with the altar and Priesthood that thereto belongeth, we use no wily policy, but with open mouth at all times and in all places we cry out upon it."

subscription, the framers of the Reformed Prayer-book had effectually destroyed all the essentials of the Mass; and no one will maintain that the Anglicans of 1570 were more orthodox in this matter than those of 1549. Indeed, from the first the Anglican Reformers had been heretical on the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice. The title of the Article ("Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross") has sometimes been appealed to as witnessing to their rejection only of such a doctrine of the Mass as would render the Sacrifice on Calvary incomplete. But it was just this which they erroneously asserted to follow from the Catholic doctrine. They rejected no popular error concerning the Mass, but the teaching of the Universal Church, which they thought, or professed to think, interfered with the all-sufficiency of the Offering on the Cross. That there was prevalent in England before the Reformation some corruption or misbelief concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice, inconsistent with the correlative truth as to the completeness of the one Oblation wherein our Lord shed his Blood, was a pure hypothesis, put forth as such by the author of Tract XC., with the view of suggesting a possible interpretation of the Article. The hypothesis has since been withdrawn; but High Churchmen still insist on regarding it as a statement of a fact. The truth is that the English Catholics of (say) 1530 believed, as Catholics believe now, that in the Mass the priest offers Christ; that it is a propitiatory Sacrifice; and that it avails for the living and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt; and this was the doctrine which the Reformers rejected. Nor does the use of the plural, "the sacrifices of Masses," make any difference. It was a common Catholic expression then, as now; and implies no sort of corruption. The actual phrase occurs, with this very reference to the benefits obtained by the

Mass for the souls of the faithful departed, in the Decree of Union signed at Florence in 1438 by the Oriental as well as by the Catholic Bishops; and of this famous definition the Reformers can scarcely have been ignorant.* How much then of the Catholic doctrine does the Article leave uncontradicted? The "literal and grammatical sense," to which an Anglican clergyman is bound to submit in its "plain and full meaning," without any attempt to "draw aside the Article," or to take "his own sense and comment to be its meaning," is surely as distinctly opposed to the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist as words can make it. And if we allow that the Reformers rejected the Catholic doctrine because they honestly believed it to be inconsistent with faith in the all-sufficiency of Christ's Sacrifice, this may be taken to lessen their guilt in the rejection of the truth, though it does not excuse their heresy; but anyhow it cannot better the position of those who know, as High Churchmen know, that the Sacrifice of the Altar does not derogate from the supreme and unique efficacy of the Sacrifice on Calvary, but merely apprehends and applies that efficacy to each succeeding generation of the faithful.

What then in this section we maintain is, that at the time of the Reformation the Church of England deliberately and entirely rejected the faith of Catholics concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice; in other words, that she

* Speaking of the souls of those who have departed this life in a state of grace, but before they have been able to make full satisfaction for their sins, the Council says: "*Eorum animas pœnis purgatoriis post mortem purgari, et ut à pœnis hujusmodi releventur prodesse eis fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes et eleemosynas, et alia pietatis officia, quæ à fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus fieri consueverunt secundum Ecclesiæ instituta.*" Compare with this the Anglican Article:—"Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgò dicebatur sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro vivis et defunctis, blasphemata figmenta sunt et perniciosæ imposturæ." The epithet *blasphema* was added in Elizabeth's reign.

repudiated the principal function for the discharge of which priests are ordained. Her Communion Service is not the Mass. A Catholic priest employing its language, and supplementing it with certain significant acts, might no doubt by its use really offer the Holy Sacrifice, though he would commit grave sin every time he did so. But as commonly performed by Anglican clergymen, whether they be priests or no, the service is certainly not the Mass ; for the mere recitation of the words of institution, without any intention to consecrate or sacrifice, would not suffice. And from 1560 to 1860 how many clergymen have had such an intention ? Conformably with the language of the Prayer-book, which has carefully excluded the innumerable sacrificial expressions of the Sarum rite, from the first *Introibo ad altare Dei* to the *Ite, missa est*, they have thought of doing no such thing ; and if the idea of sacrifice came into their minds at all, it was that they might repudiate all notion of their having any such duty to perform. Under such circumstances they would (allowing them for the moment to be priests), by merely reading through the Communion Service, neither consecrate nor sacrifice.

Anglicans might be anxious to avail themselves of this doctrine of intention, so as to be able to assert that their Church has not been guilty of continual profanation of the Holy Eucharist, inasmuch as, although her priests have all along been able to consecrate, High Churchmen alone actually have done and do so, since they only have the intention. Catholics may and do use this argument with regard to the proceedings of the apostate priests in Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns ; but Anglicans dare not make a similar application of it ; for the effect of lack of intention thus admitted would invalidate the ordinations as well as the Eucharists of that period, and so would break the succession.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

III.

§ 26. *The Real Presence and Sacraments in General.*

High Churchmen have commonly allowed that the witness borne by the Prayer-book to the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is extremely unsatisfactory ; but they hold that its poverty, both in language and ritual, does not extend to a repudiation of Catholic *sacramental* doctrine, and they think that herein can be found a sufficient testimony to the substantial nature of the Anglican Priesthood. Indeed, some are bold enough to assert that their formularies bear irrefragable witness to the Real Objective Presence ; and that, this being so, the silence of the Prayer-book concerning the Sacrifice, although to be deplored, does not hinder its really being offered by the use of the Anglican rite, inasmuch as it is consummated by a true consecration followed by the priest's communion.

As a matter of theology this is correct ; but, before it can be applied to the Anglican Communion Service, it must be shown that Anglican clergymen really do consecrate ; and to the question of the testimony that the Prayer-book bears to this tremendous act we now proceed. In passing, however, it should first of all be noted that, even if it can be shown that the Anglican formularies do witness to a Real Presence, this need not imply that the Anglican Church is in actual possession of that Presence ;

nor would Anglicanism thereby be absolved from heresy on the doctrine of the Eucharist as a whole: for the parallel case of Lutheranism shows that a sect that has no true Priesthood may use language which seems distinctly to imply an objective Presence, while the reality is absent; and that belief in the Sacrifice is not always found, as it should be, in connection with belief in the Presence.

Now, the Caroline revisers of 1661 added certain rubrics to the Church of England Communion Service, which do no doubt imply, not indeed the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence, but the existence of some sort of objective sanctity in the sacramental bread and wine. The elements were to be placed on the table at a time corresponding to the Catholic Offertory, and the prayer following this act perhaps specified them as "oblations." In the prayer containing the words of institution (now for the first time called the "Prayer of Consecration") the priest was to touch the bread and the cup while reciting those words. If a further supply of bread or wine were needed, the same words were to be repeated as a fresh consecration. At the close of the administration the remains were to be covered with a fair linen cloth, and reverently consumed after the blessing. And the "black rubric," which in Edward's reign had repudiated any "real and essential Presence," but since then had found no place in the Prayer-book, was now re-inserted in a modified form, as a protest against adoration offered to "a corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood," a clumsily-worded expression, intended no doubt as a repudiation of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.

It is, however, the existence of these rubrics in the Anglican Prayer-book of to-day which forms *prima facie* evidence, though surely weak and unsatisfactory, of the

belief of the Church of England in some kind of objective Presence. High Churchmen, who thus employ the sentences in question, are perhaps not always aware that the period which is of paramount importance when the nature of the Anglican Priesthood is under discussion—*i.e.*, the first century of the Church of England's existence—furnishes no such evidence.

Edward's Second Prayer-book, as has already been observed, was decidedly Zwinglian; and Elizabeth's differed from it, so far as the Communion Service is concerned, only in this, that with a view to comprehension (*i.e.*, the truth or falsehood of the doctrines concerned being regarded as an indifferent matter), by the omission of the rubric above referred to, and by the amalgamation into one, of the two forms for giving communion, the Catholic and the Zwinglian, some kind of belief in a Real Presence was not excluded, though neither was any such doctrine taught. The prayer which contained the words of institution did not claim to be a "consecration." No manual acts were directed, nor was any provision made for the unused bread and wine. The mode in which the service itself was performed by the ministers of the new ordination has already been adverted to. It is enough to say that no outward sign indicated any particle of belief in the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence; though all who took part in the performance had lately been familiar with the significant ritual of the Mass. And, if the language of the service were scrutinised from end to end, only a single word could be taken to imply an objective Presence,—"*grant us so to eat,*" &c., in the "*Prayer of humble access*;"—and even here it will be observed that an unworthy reception of the *res sacramenti* is not necessarily involved as an alternative (indeed, the twenty-ninth Article forbids such an interpretation); while the

words "in these holy mysteries," which had stood in 1549, were significantly omitted. It seems therefore impossible to avoid the conclusion that for a hundred years the Anglican Prayer-book was wholly conformable to the ordinary Protestant doctrine,—viz., that the Presence is in the heart of the faithful communicant, and not in the Sacrament at all.*

The bearing of this apparent negation of the Eucharistic Presence on the question before us is obvious. The possession of valid Orders involves a true Eucharist; and where these are found the Real Presence is never ignored, much less denied or its denial tolerated. The silence therefore of Elizabethan Anglicanism on this momentous subject is not less self-condemnatory than the silence already noted on the Eucharistic Sacrifice. If the Church of England had distinctly claimed for her priests the power to effect the Real Objective Presence, she would have gone a long way towards asserting that they were true *sacerdotes*; though if she did not bid them consecrate with a view to sacrifice, or at least did not imply that such is the end that consecration has in view, she would probably have invalidated her Eucharist; for, though the sacrifice is a necessary consequence of a true consecration, the consecration itself would be in danger of being frustrated if the intention to sacrifice were reserved.

And further evidence confirms the view that the Church of England in the sixteenth century admitted only a

* Even Hooker, by far the nearest approach to a High Churchman that the Anglicanism of the sixteenth century produced, says plainly (though he uses also other language, singularly beautiful, devoutly sentimental, and capable of an orthodox interpretation), "The Real Presence of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood is not therefore to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament."—"Ecclesiastical Polity," book v. cap. xvii.

Presence that was effected by the faith of the communicant, and not by the power of the priest. The Articles, though above Zwinglianism, are hardly so bold as Lutheranism ; for the twenty-eighth distinctly makes the Presence subjective ; while the twenty-ninth confirms this view, and its title plainly denies that in any sense the wicked eat the Body of Christ. There is, no doubt, one strongly worded sentence in the Catechism that might be quoted on the other side ; but this, it must be remembered, did not exist in Elizabeth's reign : and after all it merely recognises the Presence in the reception by "the faithful ;" a term which, when compared with the other official Anglican language, can only be safely taken to mean those who "draw near with faith,"—the Presence being still regarded as subjective.*

The Church of England regards as "Sacraments of the Gospel," for the faithful dispensation of which she ordains her "priests," only Baptism and the "Supper of the Lord ;" and since valid Orders are not necessary to secure a valid Baptism, even when rightly viewed as a supernatural means of grace, it would appear that the power claimed by the Anglican Church for her priests in relation to the Holy Eucharist, alone has direct bearing on our subject. And in regard to this we submit that the Elizabethan

* The strong assertions of the Real Presence made by many of the foreign Reformers, who nevertheless are believed by Anglicans not to have been in possession of that Presence, should not be overlooked when Anglican assertions are adduced as evidence of the validity of Anglican Orders. Thus, Jerome Zanchy, while making the reservation that the Body of Christ is not present to our bodies but to our minds, says boldly : "Not only are the symbols received, but the thing itself, the real Body of Christ and his real Blood, that is, Christ himself. . . . I cannot deny in the abstract the real and substantial Presence, that is, the Presence of the real and substantial Body of Christ in the Supper, but in that sense in which I have explained it." See his letter to Grindal, dated August, 1563, "*Zurich Letters*," Second Series, p. 98. Yet Zanchy was at heart a Calvinist, and only accepted Lutheran doctrine under pressure.

Church ascribed to her ministers no supernatural power, but merely authorised them to perform a service essentially the same as that of other Protestant bodies, and needing no *sacerdos* for its due discharge.

But there are other Catholic Sacraments and sacramental rites, of which the Church of England has retained at least the shadow ; and a few remarks on some of them may conveniently be appended to this section.*

Holy Matrimony, even when regarded as a true Sacrament, needs no ordained minister for its valid celebration. We have, therefore, no need to discuss the Anglican rite for its solemnisation ; but we may notice in passing that it varies from the ancient Catholic ritual far less than anything else the Prayer-book contains, though the nuptial Mass is of course omitted. The Sacrament of Extreme Unction, in spite of its Scriptural character, the Church of England has abolished altogether. The relation of Anglicanism to the Sacrament of Penance will be discussed in the next section ; and its relation to the Sacrament of Holy Order will come before us as a conclusion to this part of our subject. There remains, therefore, only the Sacrament of Confirmation to be considered here.

Now the Anglican rite, though correctly reserved to a Bishop, does not profess to be a Sacrament, nor in fact does it contain anything more distinctly sacramental than a precatory form of benediction. In one of the prayers the ceremony is described as “a sign of God’s favour and goodness,” which was the usual Protestant estimate of the nature of Sacraments in the sixteenth century ;

* The Anglican Church fell below the foreign Protestant Churches in the number of “Sacraments of the Gospel” retained. The Calvinists accepted *Order*, the Zwinglians *Matrimony*, and the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg *Penance*, as having been instituted by Christ, in addition to the two Sacraments “generally necessary for salvation.”

but there is nothing to suggest that any sacramental grace in the Catholic sense, or any sacred character, is conferred by the rite. The Bishop lays his hand on each candidate, and pronounces a blessing ; but this is nothing more than any Catholic parent or superior may do, without encroaching on the privileges of the Priesthood. For though among Catholics the blessing of a Bishop or of a simple priest is of course more highly valued than that of a lay person, it is the benediction of things and not of persons that is exclusively a sacerdotal act. Anglican Confirmation, therefore, as it stands in the Prayer-book, needs no *Summus Sacerdos* for its due administration ; nor is it regarded by Catholics as a true Confirmation at all.

And with regard to benedictions in general, the facts that the Anglican Church has totally discarded the formal blessing of things—even its “consecration” of churches being only a legal form to which a few prayers are appended—and has made the blessing of persons to be ordinarily nothing more than the solemn conclusion of a service, as is usual with all Protestant bodies, while Anglican Bishops and priests, save a few very “advanced” ones in our own day, have not been accustomed to give their blessing to individuals as a sacramental act,—all this points unmistakably in the direction of our argument, as showing that the Anglican Ministry is not, and was never intended to be, a channel of supernatural grace.

It appears, then, that very little can be made of the fact that the Church of England did not utterly set aside Sacraments in the sixteenth century, but on the contrary insisted on their necessity, and ordained priests to be faithful ministers and dispensers of them. As has been already noted, it is the modern reaction from the entire negation of all sacramental doctrine within the Established

Church throughout the eighteenth century and until the rise of Tractarianism, which predisposes men to find in this fact a testimony to the "Catholicity of the Anglican Church ;" for by itself it bears no witness to the validity of Anglican Orders which cannot with equal readiness be applied to the validity of those of the foreign Protestants as well.

It may, of course, be urged that within the Church of England there has been a continuous tradition as to the absolute necessity of a duly ordained minister for the administration of the Holy Communion, and that even Low Churchmen would not allow a deacon, much less a layman, to take that service. This no doubt is true ; but it may be questioned whether there is here any recognition of the supernatural power of Order, and not rather a mere shrinking from what would seem to be a breach of legality, and certainly of propriety and decorum. Wesleyans would be just as certain to protest, if one of their local preachers attempted to celebrate the Communion ; yet they do not acknowledge a sacramental grace of Orders in their circuit ministers, whose Eucharists they regard as valid. And it should also be remembered that the Anglican tradition which demands a man in "full orders" to administer the Lord's Supper, demands also an ordained minister to perform the Sacrament of Baptism. It is only quite in recent years that Anglicans have assented to the Catholic recognition of the validity of lay baptism. The old school of High Churchmen would never have allowed that a layman could be "a lawful minister" of baptism ; and it would appear that in this case, as well as in the other, it was no supernatural gift conferred by ordination, but merely the formal commission then granted, which was thought to enable the minister duly to administer the Sacrament, whether of Baptism or of the "Supper of the Lord."

We contend then that, so far as we have yet gone, we have seen grounds for drawing a clear distinction between Catholic and Anglican ordination, inasmuch as the former is believed sacramentally to *empower* a man to consecrate, sacrifice, and perform other supernatural functions, while the latter only formally *authorises* him to discharge certain ministerial duties, to which, so far as he is himself concerned, no mysterious efficacy is attached.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

IV.

§ 27. *The Sacrament of Penance.*

But a High Churchman may argue thus :—" I admit the unsatisfactory character of the Elizabethan Prayer-book in regard to the Holy Eucharist, and indeed, in regard to all the Sacraments which demand a Bishop or a priest for their administration, save only one to which I shall now appeal. On the doctrine of the Sacrifice that Prayer-book was at least silent, if not, as you assert, antagonistic to the Catholic faith ; and, on the doctrine of the Real Presence, it was at least ambiguous, if not, as you assert, silent. All this is bad enough ; and more might be added to it. But remember that from the very first the Anglican Bishop in ordaining a priest has laid his hands upon him, and to the form, ' Receive the Holy Ghost,' has added the words, ' Whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.' Is there not here distinctly recognised a true sacerdotal function, such as defines and fixes the intention with which the Anglican form is used ? And if the Bishop's intention is thus directed to the ordaining of an absolving priest, must he not at the same time ordain a sacrificing priest, a true *sacerdotem* in every sense, though he uses no words to express this other priestly function ? for who ever heard of a priest who had received power to absolve but not to say Mass ?"

The argument is subtle and plausible, and deserves

consideration ; though, as we shall see later, it is distinctly met and refuted by the principles of Catholic theology. Here, however, it will suffice to indicate one or two points which certainly break its force.

Admitting the sufficiency of the Anglican form in itself, there can be no doubt but that the intention of a modern High Church Bishop—for example, Dr. Mylne, of Bombay—suffices to give to the words that significance that would render them operative. He uses them as a sacramental formula ; he really intends to give the Holy Ghost for the ordination of a true priest ; and specially with the view of conferring on the ordinand the power of absolution. But with regard to Holy Order, a man cannot give what he has not himself received (as, on the other hand, is the case with Baptism) ; therefore the good intention of the modern High Churchman is of no avail unless he be first of all a true Bishop himself ; and, if our argument be sound, this is what he is not, inasmuch as the succession was broken long ago in the time of the Elizabethan Bishops, whose whole notion of ordination differed substantially from his.

Moreover, it should be observed that it is to the secondary, and not to the primary function of a priest that the Anglican form witnesses, if it really witnesses to one of them at all ; and it is a less tenable hypothesis that the greater function would come in along with the less, than that the less would necessarily be included if the greater were distinctly granted.

And then, again, it must be pointed out that, if the Catholic principle be correct (and High Churchmen will not dispute it), that unless a man be wholly a priest he is not one at all, the Anglican counter-assertion that if a man be partly a priest he must be wholly one, is not an argument, but a begging of the question.

Certainly there is no doubt of the essential unity of the Priesthood ; and all admit that he who has the power to absolve has also the power to offer the Holy Sacrifice. But, that these powers may be legitimately exercised, a grant of authority is also needed ; indeed, with regard to the power of absolution, this authority is ordinarily necessary, not merely for its legitimate, but even for its valid exercise. It belongs to the Bishop of the diocese to grant or withhold this authority ; and, according to the present discipline of the Church, the faculties by which it is bestowed, whether written or merely verbal, require renewal from time to time.

There is nothing essentially new or peculiar to the Roman Church, as Anglicans have sometimes maintained, in this most necessary system of priests giving absolution not without the express permission of the Bishop in whose diocese they hear confessions. It prevails in the schismatical Churches of the East as well as in the West, and it has its roots in antiquity. Originally the Bishop was the sole absolver of those within his jurisdiction ; and in truth he is so still, although, as the discipline of Penance has been extended, and the practice of confession become more frequent, he has delegated his authority, first to one or more Penitentiaries, and now to all, or nearly all priests who are at work in his diocese.* But his legitimate position is still witnessed to by his reservation to himself of authority to absolve from certain grave sins, *e.g.*, wilful murder. High Churchmen would do well to

* "The penitentiary discipline was at first wholly under the direction of the Bishop, who by prayer and the laying on of hands reconciled the penitents to the Church. . . . During the persecution under Decius the number of those who denied the faith was so great that the Bishops were obliged to appoint priests (*presbyteri penitentiarii*) to aid in the work of reconciling such to the Church." Alzog's "Universal Church History," translated by Pabisch and Byrne, vol. i. p. 298. (Dublin : Gill and Son, 1879.)

remember that, on the principles of primitive antiquity which they profess, all their absolutions are null, unless they are pronounced with the leave and authority of the Bishop of the diocese, as something apart from and beyond the power of absolution itself, which they think they have received at their ordination. If the administration of the Sacrament of Penance were an ordinary part of the Anglican system, it might, no doubt, be maintained that a licence to a curacy, or an institution to a benefice, conveyed the necessary faculties, though the absence of any mention of such permission would be a serious objection to this view. But some of the most popular Anglican confessors have no official connection at all with the Bishop of the diocese wherein they pronounce absolution ; and the conductors of Anglican missions and retreats go from one end of the country to the other, exercising, as they think, sacerdotal functions ; yet they do not venture even to inform Low Church Bishops of their proceedings.*

The justice of this Catholic principle, which insists on the need of a grant of jurisdiction to validate a priest's absolution, will not need to be further insisted on when it is realised that the confessional is a tribunal, and that the priest sits there as judge. So far as his offering of Sacrifice is concerned, the priest's act is one that relates immediately to God, and he has to do with the people only indirectly, through their uniting themselves with his act. He can, therefore, at will validly exercise this function, and needs only a consecrated altar, an approved place,

* It should be added that, on Catholic principles, the Anglican Bishops are incapable of granting true jurisdiction to their clergy, inasmuch as, being separate from the Pope, they have none themselves. Civil jurisdiction they may have, as officers of the State ; but spiritual jurisdiction they have not, be their Episcopal character ever so certain. See in the Appendix, Note X. on "Anglican Jurisdiction."

and the other requisites of the Church to render the act legitimate. But his other principal function, of retaining or remitting sins, brings him into immediate contact with the faithful ; his office in the confessional places him in the position of a ruler over subjects ; and it is obvious that such a power could not safely be entrusted even to duly ordained men without any restriction, so that they might use it anywhere and at any time indiscriminately, nor ever forfeit its valid exercise, however unworthy of it they might prove. Under such circumstances the Sacrament of Penance would have been ordained to the destruction of the Church, and not to her edification.

Secular jurisdiction furnishes a ready parallel to the restrictions placed by the Church on spiritual jurisdiction. A man may have every qualification enabling him to discharge the functions of a secular judge, but all his acts would be null unless he had received authority from the Crown. So also, a magistrate for the county of Norfolk does not cease to be a magistrate when he enters Suffolk, but he cannot act as such unless he receive a fresh commission for the latter county. And similarly, the Judges on circuit need on each occasion to obtain their faculties from the State ; though their personal qualifications, which may be compared with the power given in ordination, remain with them, and were acquired previously and independently. Their case is parallel with that of priests who are sent to conduct a special mission.

Thus much then may be said as to the general principle of jurisdiction in the confessional, the absence of which invalidates an absolution.* Theologians, no doubt, allow

* The Catholic doctrine is thus stated by the Council of Trent (Sess. xiv., cap. 7) :—"Quoniam igitur natura et ratio iudicii illud exposcit ut sententia in subditos dumtaxat feratur, persuasum semper in Ecclesiâ Dei fuit, et verissi-

that there may be cases in which the Church tacitly supplies jurisdiction which would otherwise be lacking ; so that penitents confessing in good faith to priests who, (also in good faith), have no legitimate authority to absolve, still obtain absolution. But the principles on which such concessions are based (which may be found in treatises on moral theology) are hardly applicable to the case of Anglican absolutions (valid Orders being assumed); but they might perhaps cover those pronounced, *e.g.*, among the schismatical Greeks, which are anyhow valid *in articulo mortis*.

Now the total absence of any such discipline as this in the Anglican Church at once arouses a suspicion that the Reformers did not retain the words, "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c., in their obvious and Catholic sense. Such a discipline had existed in the Catholic Church of England until the days of Cranmer, but it totally disappeared with the advent of the Anglican system. Are we, then, to suppose that the Reformers intended to ordain absolving priests, and at the same time to free them from the trammels of the old disciplinary regulations? So preposterous a view of the action of men who rejected Penance from among the Sacraments of the Gospel, and condemned it as a "corrupt following of the Apostles" cannot possibly be maintained. Yet if this was not their aim, we can only conclude that they knew full well that the men ordained with this form would make no pretence to have received a sacramental commission to absolve. For indeed the office of a judge of consciences is too tremendous a trust to be given to men, unless there be a watchful authority superintending

mum esse Synodus hæc confirmat, nullius momenti absolutionem esse debere quam sacerdos in eum profert in quem ordinariam aut subdelegatam non habet jurisdictionem."

its exercise, and able by a word to withdraw it. And since no such superintendence has been or is exercised within the Anglican Church, we are led to suspect that neither is there any such power.*

We maintain, then, that the best commentary on the meaning of the words in the Reformed Ordinal is to be found in the contemporaneous disuse of the Sacrament of Penance in the Anglican Church. The belief that only thereby is post-baptismal sin ordinarily forgiven, died away in England as quickly and as completely as did belief in the Sacrifice of the Mass; and that under the guidance of men who, if the High Church theory as to the sense of the Anglican form of ordination be correct, were distinctly entrusted with the powers of penitentiary priests. There has been in the Anglican Church no tradition of the Sacrament of Penance. An imposing catena of Anglican divines in favour of some kind of *confession*, and that private and made to a clergyman, can no doubt be produced; but this does not really bear upon our subject. The practice of confession is not *per se* a witness to the existence of a true Priesthood. Protestant communities, energetically rejecting sacerdotal doctrine, have valued and used confession. But our controversy has to do with sacramental *absolution*. And so, when Hooker is adduced as an example of a primitive Anglican who "went to confession," we ask, "Did he obtain sacramental absolution, and from whom?" And the only answer that can be given is that Saravia, who had not been Episcopally ordained, absolved him, presumably "by the ministry of God's Holy Word."

The Sacrament of Penance is in fact rejected when it is

* See in the Appendix, Note XI. on "Anglicanism and the Regulation of Confession."

denied that the priest's absolution, joined with the contrition, confession and satisfaction of the penitent, is the only ordinary means divinely ordained for freeing the soul from grave sin committed after baptism. If this doctrine be abandoned (and it is surely clear that the Church of England has abandoned it), confession loses that position which it holds in the Catholic economy of grace, and needs no sacerdotal Ministry to receive it and to meet it with sacramental absolution. It becomes merely a "work of supererogation," performed for the sake of the interior consolation that it affords. If confession is thus deprecated as the ordinary means of obtaining pardon, if it is recommended only in extreme cases, as when some great crime troubles the conscience, or in the hour of death ;— if a man may commit mortal sins, and then do as he pleases about seeking formal absolution before going to communion, it is clear that the essential character of the Sacrament of Penance is ignored. The admission of a voluntary application for absolution "by the ministry of God's Holy Word," 'as a *dernier ressort* for whose who, (as is implied), ought to have been able to "quiet their consciences" without it, but from some exceptional cause have failed to do so, is not a mark of a "Church" possessing a sacerdotal Ministry. Luther and Calvin defended private confession and absolution of this kind quite as warmly as Anglicans until recent days have done.* They had not even any objection to the use of an authoritative form of absolution, provided it were understood as a declaration for the comfort of the penitent, who was really absolved by God without any human intervention. In their sense "I absolve thee" had no sacramental force, but merely stood for "I declare thee

* See Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," book vi, cap. iv.

absolved." Now if this be also the Anglican doctrine, that is, the doctrine of the Prayer-book and of its compilers,* it is clear that the words contained in the Anglican Ordinal, and in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, on which so much stress is now laid, do not necessarily imply the existence of sacerdotal character in the Anglican Ministry.

The ordinary "absolution" of the Church of England occurs in the daily service, and follows the general confession. It is simply declaratory in form; it states a fact about the goodness of God, and exhorts the people to seek to avail themselves of that goodness. In fact, so far as its terms go, it might be pronounced by a layman; though since 1662 the rubric has restricted its recitation to a "priest."† In the Communion Service a precatory

* It may be objected that the Anglican Church is not bound by the opinions of the compilers of the Prayer-book, and that a natural interpretation of its language must be allowed to stand, though known to be opposed to the *animus imponentium*. This is true enough of legal documents, and may fairly be employed in interpreting the Articles. But in the case of sacramental forms the *animus imponentium* cannot be disregarded; for on that, if the form be ambiguous, depends the sense and significance with which it was used, and therefore its sufficiency and force.

† This so-called "absolution" first appeared in the Zwinglian Prayer-book of 1552. "There was a heresy common at the time that absolution does not convey sacramental grace, but is only a declaration that God does forgive those who are truly penitent, and have sincere faith; and thus the whole virtue and efficacy of the absolution is in the faith and repentance of the receiver, not in the act of the priest. . . . This form was intended to give expression to this heresy; and there is no doubt that its Zwinglian authors intended the other two forms to be understood in the same sense. . . . Various Anglican divines, for instance Dr. Hook, explain the three forms as being of equal force and efficacy, thus reducing the other two to the level of this." Canon Estcourt's "Dogmatic Teaching of the Book of Common Prayer," p. 71. Modern High Churchmen appreciate the hollowness of the "absolution" in the daily service, and correctly enough admit that the form in the Visitation Office is alone capable of a sacramental use. Accordingly they employ it with a freedom which the Prayer-book itself certainly does not contemplate. But the old school of High Churchmen thought differently. They regarded the declaration in Morning and Evening Prayer as a true absolution; and it is

or benedictory form occurs ; and this again is to be used only by a "priest." Yet it contains nothing but what in the Catholic services is habitually said by laymen. Thus, at every Mass the server, commonly a boy, addresses to the priest this "benedictory form of absolution":—"Almighty God have mercy upon thee, forgive thee thy sins, and bring thee unto everlasting life."

So far, then, the Anglican Priesthood is commissioned to remit sins only in terms which require no sacerdotal character at all. But there is also the strong authoritative absolution to be used under special circumstances in the hour of death. The words are in fact the form, or at least the essential part of the form, of the Catholic Sacrament of Penance. But there are good reasons for thinking that from the lips of an Anglican priest they have not, and were never meant to have, a sacramental efficacy. To begin with, their use must be most exceptional where the spirit of the Prayer-book is faithfully adhered to. For first of all the dying man (and there has been since 1552 absolutely no authority for the employment of this form save in the case of the dying) is to make in general terms a profession of repentance, of charity, and of forgiveness of injuries, in reply to the interrogations of the minister, who is next to admonish him to declare his debts, to make his will, "for the quietness of his executors," and to be liberal to the poor. After all this has been done, if he still feel his conscience to be "troubled

not so many years since, in what was then the most "advanced" Church in Oxford, a solemnity of demeanour, not unlike that at the elevation in the Catholic Mass, was required to be observed by all while the barren formula was being read. Late-comers had to remain in the porch during its recitation, and the very pew-opener knelt in the aisle. And in poetry written by one of the most extreme men of the day it was described as "the golden key each morn and eve;" an expression which Dr. Bright has developed in his verses entitled "The Evening Absolution."

with any weighty matter," and under no other circumstances, he is to be moved to make a "special confession" of his sins; and then, at his humble and hearty request, as the revisers of 1661 directed, the authoritative absolution is to be pronounced.

Whether, even in so rare a case as this, when on his death-bed a man of evil life might well have longed for the *Absolvo te* of Catholic times, the compilers of the Prayer-book were justified in placing in the mouths of their ministers words, which, if taken in their literal significance, are so inconsistent with all else that Anglicanism has retained, may well be doubted; but it is no business of ours to defend their conduct. It is, however, worth noting that the very fact that they made the use of this form so exceptional, proves that they did not hold it necessary for forgiveness. If they had regarded its use as a sacramental act conveying grace to the soul, it would have been utterly unreasonable in them not to offer so precious a gift to penitent sinners during their life-time, and to grant it so grudgingly even in death. In short, it is difficult not to conclude that this Anglican absolution, though Catholic in form, was retained as merely subjective in effect. Its use did not really cleanse the soul from sin, but produced a quieting of the awakened conscience by declaring the positive certainty of that forgiveness which the man's own faith and repentance were thought to have already secured.*

* Hooker's doctrine on absolution, which was fully as "advanced" as anything taught in the Church of England until quite recent days, may be found in his "Ecclesiastical Polity," book vi. cap. vi. He admits that there is "a great difference between the doctrine of Rome and ours;" and so it appears a little later when he asks, "What is then the force of absolution? . . . Does it really take away sin, or but ascertain us of God's most gracious and merciful pardon?" and replies, "The latter is our assertion, the former theirs." Clearly, then, according to Hooker, an Anglican absolution is a mere declaration, and has no sacramental effect.

Two explanations have been given of the retention of this authoritative form in the Elizabethan Prayer-book. It has been thought that it was intended to afford some such satisfaction as this to those who still clung to much of the ancient Catholic belief. Many of the clergy who first used the book were actually priests, ordained in Catholic times, and their absolutions, in spite of the heresy, schism, and other irregularities into which they had lapsed, would be valid on Catholic principles when pronounced (in default of a canonical priest) in the hour of death. The retention of the Catholic form in the book would sanction such an act.*

But another explanation has been suggested. The Anglican form is an abbreviation of that in the Catholic ritual. It omits any direct reference to "excommunication, suspension, and interdict," but it inserts the word "all ;" and it has been thought that the intention of this change was to unite in one sentence the absolution from censure and from sin. And since the Anglican Reformers and their disciples did not believe in the power of the priest actually to absolve from the guilt of sin, the words, grotesquely enough, came to be regarded as a formal removal of ecclesiastical censures alone. This interpretation seems strained, but there is a continuous tradition in its favour, including many of the most famous Anglican names ; and it appears to be accepted by the majority of Anglican clergymen in the present day.†

* This explanation does not of course account for its retention in 1604 and 1661. But it should be remembered that both those revisions were the work of High Churchmen, who, though they did not believe in the Sacrament of Penance, were nevertheless scrupulous in holding to every syllable in the Prayer-book that favoured their hierarchical pretensions.

† See "The Power of the Keys, its true nature and extent," by N. S. (Parker, 1878.)

The Church of England has always prohibited the Christian burial of persons who die excommunicate, though the precise rubric to that effect was not inserted until 1661, and though the prohibition, together with excommunication itself, have now for a long time been obsolete. No form of excommunication is indeed provided, but it may be incurred *ipso facto* in more than one way; and there appears to be no means of removing the ban save by this absolution. It is not the correct form, certainly; but the insertion of the word "all" makes it very inclusive; and it was evidently meant to meet the case of "notorious evil livers." Here, then, is a possible explanation of its use being confined to the hour of death. It was to be pronounced so as to qualify such persons for Christian burial.

Now this absolution from excommunication in the hour of death may on Catholic principles be validly pronounced by a layman in default of a priest. Such, at least, is the opinion of some theologians; though others hold that an excommunicate, known to have died penitent, but without the assistance of a priest, should be publicly absolved from the excommunication after his death, according to the form provided in the Ritual.* Either opinion testifies to the non-sacramental character of the act which absolves only from ecclesiastical censures, and so is at least indirectly relevant to our subject.

The writer does not profess to be wholly satisfied with either of the above explanations, and prefers to regard the retention of the form *Absolve te* in the Anglican Prayer-book as merely a foolish inconsistency. But they are nevertheless deserving of consideration as the commentaries of Anglicans themselves on the meaning of their own formularies, and as thus indicating their repudiation of

* St. Alphonsus, "Theol. Moral.," lib. vi., tract iv., § 540.

the view that the retention of this form necessarily involves the conclusion that ministers ordained with the Anglican rites have at least one function entrusted to them which they cannot duly discharge unless their Orders be sacerdotal.

In one other case confession and some sort of absolution are recognised by the Prayer-book. Again it is an exceptional case, though one which would presumably be less rare than that which has above been considered. A man desires to go to communion, but is unable privately to quiet his conscience. He is then invited to "open his grief" to a "learned and discreet minister." Evidently only the specially disquieting sin or sins are to be confessed ; and then he is to receive the "benefit of absolution by the ministry of God's Holy Word." The expressions are vague, and certainly do not call for the interpretation now put upon them by Ritualists, who transform this exhortation, which had wholly fallen into disuse, into an authorisation of the Sacrament of Penance ; and, minutely imitating the practice of Catholics, so far as they can ascertain it, insist on their adherents habitually confessing all the sins, great or small, that they can remember, to a priest, who, vested in surplice and purple stole, and seated in the vestry or some makeshift confessional, proceeds to meet this confession by pronouncing, professedly as a sacramental act, the form of absolution which he has fetched from the Visitation of the Sick. The vast majority of Anglicans, and among them several now on the Episcopal bench, have held and hold that to soothe the penitent's emotions by reading to him suitable passages from Holy Scripture would accurately fulfil the prescribed directions, and that this is in fact all that is contemplated by the phrase "the benefit of absolution by the ministry of God's Holy Word." And this interpretation appears to be the

correct one ; for, whereas in 1549, when the authoritative absolution was ordered to be used in all private confessions, the exhortation said it was to be received "of us, as of the ministers of God and of the Church," and an apology was added for those who used and for those who neglected "auricular and secret confession,"—in 1552 and thenceforward this language, which certainly admitted a sacramental view of the act in question, has all been omitted or altered, and that evidently with a distinct intention. It is no longer "absolution" but the "benefit of absolution" which is to be received—a new form of expression which is perhaps not without significance. Interpreted by the context, and by the practice of the original Anglican clergy, it appears to mean "what really amounts to absolution," "what will do for him all that the old priest's absolution could do." For this "benefit" was to be received "by the ministry of God's Holy Word,"—also a novel expression, which, under the circumstances of its introduction, can hardly be taken as referring to the Sacrament of Penance. Moreover, at the same time the direction to use the authoritative form of absolution in private confessions was omitted, and therefore its employment, save only at a death-bed, presumably discouraged, if not forbidden, and certainly not sanctioned. Putting all these facts together, it appears that the Ritualistic priest who, under the circumstances noted above, says to his kneeling penitent, "I absolve thee from all thy sins," is supported in this act neither by his Bishop nor by his Prayer-book, and that his words are really vain, and loose neither on earth nor in heaven.*

* The writer has reason to know that there are some few High Church clergymen, who hear confessions, and who go to confession themselves, without really believing that the Church of England authorises the Sacrament of Penance in the Catholic sense. They value the confessional as the best means

On the whole, then, it is difficult to see how the conclusion can be avoided that the Anglican priest was never really intended to perform a function in the forgiveness of sins such as that which a Catholic priest discharges. The English Reformers believed no more than Luther, Calvin, or Zwingli in a spiritual power granted by Christ to his Apostles, and thenceforward conveyed by consecration and ordination to their successors, in virtue of which they could by a sacramental action really cleanse the souls of the contrite from the stain of sin. They thought that the ministry of reconciliation consisted solely in the free proclamation of the Gospel of forgiveness, and in an authoritative declaration of the pardon granted immediately by God to all who had repentance and faith. They therefore intended their priests to discharge the office of remitting sin entrusted to them at their ordination, by preaching forgiveness, by pointing to the words of Scripture, or by the reading of such declarations as are contained in the daily services. And should they, under special circumstances, be called upon to comfort an uneasy conscience in the hour of death, they were authorised to use the solemn words of the ancient Catholic ritual, not indeed in virtue of any spiritual power which a sacramental ordination had conferred upon them, but so as to produce the desired assurance of that forgiveness which the sinner's faith and contrition had already obtained. It

for securing that intimate relation between pastor and flock which is essential to true spiritual guidance; and they cannot deny that the act of private confession is better than anything else calculated to elicit acts of faith and contrition such as (in their opinion), really secure the pardon which their own absolution only formally declares. This is no doubt a position reconcilable with Anglican doctrine; but it may be doubted whether the men who hold it are justified in imitating the externals of the Catholic Sacrament of Penance, in using the form "I absolve thee," or in leading people to suppose in any other way that they are in possession of a power in relation to the forgiveness of sins such as the Catholic Church ascribes to her priests.

was an inconsistency, certainly, to retain these words, perhaps it was worse than an inconsistency; but the compilers of the Prayer-book were not the best of men, and did not act under divine guidance. The inconsistency has been felt by the majority of the members of the Church of England who happen to know what is contained in the obscure corners of the Prayer-book. They have complained that this form of absolution is out of harmony with all else that the book contains, and they would gladly have been rid of it. But failing in this, they have now to face the unwelcome fact that, on the strength of this one sentence, any Anglican clergyman, in spite of Parliament, Bishop, and flock, may set up the confessional, if not in his Church, at least in his vestry or private study, and may teach from his pulpit and in his parish schools that grave sin committed after baptism can only be forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance, through the absolution which he professes to be, though he is not really, qualified to pronounce.

The alleged witness of the Anglican Church to the administration of the Sacrament of Penance has been considered at some length, for there can be no doubt but that, taken together with the retention of the term "priest," the significance of which must next be examined, it has done more than anything else to throw a haze of probability over the High Church claim to the possession of Orders in the Catholic sense. Our explanation of the meaning of the words in the Ordinal, as interpreted by the language of other parts of the Prayer-book, may be deemed insufficient and inconclusive; but it is difficult to see how, in view of what confession actually has been until the last few years within the Church of England (and the life of a community interprets the language of its laws), the use of the words "Whose sins thou dost

forgive," &c., can be shown to have been more than one of those empty and meaningless inconsistencies which follow upon all attempts at compromise, where compromise really sacrifices what it professes to preserve. The compilers of the Ordinal were anxious above all things to be "Scriptural." No other part of the ancient form of priestly ordination had this characteristic, in their sense of the term, save only the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c. They could therefore retain them, and so give some slight satisfaction to the conservative party ; while even the advanced Protestants were bound not to shrink from the words of Scripture, however Catholic their tone. They therefore accepted them, and proceeded to explain them away, maintaining that neither the Apostles nor their successors had any power to forgive sins in the sense in which the Church taught they had.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

V.

§ 28. *The Retention of the Term "Priest."*

Nevertheless, in spite of all that has been urged against the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry, on the ground that no office needing sacerdotal powers for its discharge has certainly been entrusted to it, the High Churchman has still one more strand by which to hold. "If the English Reformers," he may argue, "did not intend to retain the true Priesthood in the Anglican Church, why did they retain the name of priest at all? There were plenty of other words they might have used, all of which would have been more acceptable to the Protestant party. They might have called their clergy presbyters, elders, pastors, ministers, anything rather than priests, for that term had from time immemorial been used of the Catholic sacerdotal Ministry, and was on that very account rejected everywhere by the Reformers except in England. Is it not therefore clear that they retained the word because they meant to retain the thing?" We must estimate the cogency of this argument.

First it may be pointed out that, as a mere matter of etymology, "priest" need not involve anything sacerdotal at all. It is an abbreviated form of "prester" or "presbyter," the Greek for "elder," just as "Bishop" is "episcopus" or "overseer." So far, then, as the bare words

go, the Anglican Ministry may consist merely of elders governed by superintendents or overseers, neither rank containing *sacerdotes* in the Catholic sense. And it will hardly be denied that the functions entrusted to them give a *prima facie* support to this view.

Now the term "priest" has two Latin equivalents, *sacerdos* and *presbyter*, and both are freely used in Catholic theology and liturgical books, though the former is more common. In earlier times *sacerdos* as often as not meant Bishop, whereas for more than sixteen centuries *presbyter* has designated exclusively one who belongs to the lower rank of the Priesthood; and in the present day it is chiefly used when there is occasion to distinguish between the two ranks; while *sacerdos* alone can be correctly employed in rubrics or elsewhere, when the exercise of any priestly function common to both Bishops and priests, such as consecrating, sacrificing, absolving or blessing is referred to. It needs no long study of Catholic liturgical books to become convinced that this systematic use of the two terms is carefully observed.

Now the Elizabethan Prayer-book did not employ in its rubrics the term "priest" exclusively; it spoke of "minister" more frequently. And even on High Church principles there might be good reason to use the wider term, since there is of course much in the Prayer-book services needing, on any theory, no priest for its performance. But did the Reformed service-book use the two terms on any such definite system? Did it direct the "minister" to read Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Epistles and Gospels, and restrict absolutions, blessings, and the principal function in the Communion Service to the "priest"? Up to a certain point it did, but not consistently. Morning and Evening Prayer were to be read by "the Minister," but he was described as "Priest" when

he said, "O God, make speed to save us." And at both services "the Minister alone" pronounced the absolution. He remained "the Minister" until after the second Our Father, and as such said "O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us," but he became "Priest" when he continued "O Lord, save the Queen." The Litany spoke of "Bishops, Pastors, and Ministers of the Church," and another prayer of "Bishops, Pastors, and Curates." The Communion Service used the term "Priest" more frequently; but the officiant was called "Minister" when he read the Commandments, and when he received and gave communion; and the Ornaments Rubric spoke of "the Minister at the time of the Communion"—an expression which in a Catholic Prayer-book would have meant the assistant who served the priest; but in Elizabeth's book the reference was to what Ritualists now call "the celebrant." "Priest" was similarly interchanged with "Minister" in the Occasional Offices; and in the Marriage Service especially the alternation became almost grotesque. "Priest" occurred eight times and "Minister" thirteen, and in one place it was "the Priest," and in another "the Minister" who was to give the blessing; and throughout the reference was obviously to the same person.

The significance of all this can hardly escape notice, for it was evidently no mere accident. By this interchange of words, the Reformers wished to show that they attributed to their "priests" no powers which a "minister" did not share. The two terms were in fact to be regarded as synonymous; and so the former word was robbed of that special meaning which it had hitherto borne. Not that they could deprive it of its significance altogether, but only in its application to Anglican clergymen; for it retained its old sense in common use, and was soon exclusively employed to designate Catholic

priests ; and it is with this application that the term has come down to our own day. The circumstances of its use in the Anglican Prayer-book may have caused its sacerdotal significance therein to disappear ; but, outside that book, wherever the English language is spoken (save only in the narrow Ritualistic circle), “a priest,” without further limitation, is always understood to mean one of the Pope’s clergymen.

Official Latin documents were put forth by the Anglican Church in the sixteenth century ; and in these, excluding passages from Holy Scripture, where the reference is primarily to the Jewish Priesthood, the term “priest” was only once rendered *sacerdos*, and that was in the title of Article XXXII., *De Conjugio Sacerdotum*. As this solitary instance has been claimed by Anglicans as an authoritative witness to the sacerdotal character of their Orders, it may be well to point out that the priests whose marriage is here vindicated were indeed *sacerdotes*, ordained in Catholic times. No one doubted whether the priests of the new ordination might have wives, like other Protestant ministers ; but many people might well have felt qualms about the legitimacy of the marriage of the elder clergy ; for it was the universal belief among Catholics then, as now, that the reception of Sacred Orders formed an *impedimentum dirimens* to Matrimony, and that therefore a marriage subsequently contracted was such only in name. If the title of the Article had fully explained itself it would have run thus :—“A Salve for the Consciences of those Apostate Priests who have either broken or desire to break their Solemn Obligation to Celibacy.” That this interpretation is the correct one is evident from the parallel use of the word in the Augsburg and Wurtemberg Confessions.*

* Even the unscrupulous conscience of Elizabeth revolted against the

Two unofficial versions of the Anglican Prayer-book, published since the accession of Elizabeth, have employed the term *sacerdos* to represent "priest." Their use of the word carries, of course, less weight than its appearance in authoritative documents would have done ; still it is not without significance.

The first of these, commonly known as Haddon's, appeared in 1560, soon after Parker's consecration, and, following Ales' version of the Prayer-book of 1549, retained a good deal of Catholic phraseology. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this was due to any tenderness for the old religion. Rather it was a political expedient, designed to give satisfaction to the clergy at the Universities, who were little disposed to conform to the Reformed religion, and who would probably have refused altogether to accept the new order of things, had nothing been done to hide the gulf which really separated the new faith from the old. Nor can anything be made of the use of the term *sacerdos* in this book.* It was interchanged with *minister* in such manner as to reduce its meaning to merely "the officiant" of whatever rank. Thus, at Morning and Evening Prayer it was *minister* who pronounced the absolution ; and, though in the Communion Service it was *sacerdos* who discharged this function, the same man was described as *minister* in the next rubric. He began the service as *minister*, stood

marriage of priests. "Married ladies were at this time addressed as *Madame*, unmarried ladies as *Mistress* ; and when Mrs. Parker [the wife of the first Protestant Archbishop, who was at any rate a priest], advanced at the close of a sumptuous entertainment at Lambeth to take leave of the Queen, Elizabeth feigned a momentary hesitation. '*Madame*,' she said at last, 'I may not call you, and *Mistress* I am loth to call you ; however I thank you for your good cheer.'" Green's "History of the English People." p. 371.

* It did not contain the Ordinal, and so gives no support to the theory that the Elizabethan Bishops ordained *sacerdotes* ; which is, after all, the only important point.

up correctly enough as *sacerdos* to read what is now called the "Prayer of Consecration," but relapsed into *minister* to receive the communion. And in the Visitation Office the sick man was to be examined by and to make his confession to *sacerdos*, but, oddly enough, *minister* was to pronounce the absolution. Here again, as in the English Prayer-book, the interchange of terms was obviously intentional; and its effect is to rob the word *sacerdos* of all special significance. This Latin Version is in fact an early and striking example of what has all along been characteristic of Anglicanism, as distinguished from other forms of Protestantism—viz., the employment of Catholic language under such conditions as to wean it from its ancient Catholic associations, and so to appropriate its solemnity and dignity, while the "superstitions" to which it had been wedded are discarded.*

The other unofficial version referred to (Bright and Medd's), appeared only a few years ago, and is strongly

* This is especially true of the writings of Hooker. The magnificence of his style and the wealth of his erudition, coupled with his free use of Patristic and even of Scholastic language, have often deceived people as to his true theological position, which was in fact as thoroughly Protestant as that of any Low Churchman of the present day. He denies the necessity of Episcopal ordination; he repudiates the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and even sacramental doctrine in the Catholic sense. He expresses his preference for the new-fangled term "presbyter" rather than "priest;" though, with the true Anglican instinct, he deprecates the exclusion of the latter word. And his apology for its retention is significant. Admitting that "sacrifice is now no part of the church-ministry," and that "the Gospel hath properly now no sacrifice," he still thinks that Christian ministers may be called priests, "even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes, which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing." Moreover he urges that the term may be safely used, inasmuch as, when the people hear the name, "it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age." ("Ecclesiastical Polity," Book v. cap. lxxviii.) Whether he was correct as to the popular sense of the term may fairly be doubted, seeing that at the very time he was writing men were continually being put to death simply as "priests." But, as applied to the Anglican ministers, no doubt what he says was true enough, that the word had lost its meaning. And

marked by the characteristics of the modern High Church movement. The terms *sacerdos* and *presbyter* are carefully employed in accordance with the Catholic principle indicated above ; and the language throughout is taken or imitated from Catholic liturgical books. The Articles find no place in it, and the anti-Catholic oaths of the Ordinal are omitted, so that the effect of the whole is marvellously unlike that of any other version of the Anglican formularies. Since it is a translation of the Caroline and not of the Elizabethan Prayer-book, it would not concern us here, were it not for the necessity of calling attention to the false impression of the theological value of Anglican Orders, which it must give to those whose sole source of information on the subject it is. The Preface states that the book was put forth partly with the view of setting before foreign Catholics, *veriorem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ imaginem*, and to demonstrate to them that the same Church has preserved *tum fidem verè Catholicam, tum regimen verè Apostolicum et primitivum*. We will suppose that they turn to the Ordinal, to ascertain with what justice Catholics have condemned Anglican Orders on theological grounds ; and to their surprise they find this form for priestly ordination used with the imposition of hands :—*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum in officium et opus*

thus explained away it might well be allowed to pass ; but its retention under such circumstances has none of that significance which Ritualists would seek to attach to it.

Moreover, with regard to the word “presbyter,” for which Hooker expresses his preference, it should be observed that the use of the Latin *presbyter* in Catholic liturgical books is no precedent for it. “Priest” is the English for *presbyter*, and so it has always been rendered in Catholic translations of the New Testament ; but “presbyter,” as itself an English word, is a Protestant and not a Catholic title at all, and was first introduced in the sixteenth century with the view of repudiating the old doctrine concerning the nature of the Christian Ministry, by calling attention to the original etymological meaning of the word.

Sacerdotis in Ecclesiâ Dei per impositionem manuum nostrarum jam tibi commissum. Quorum remiseric peccata, &c. There is, of course, no hint that the definite and significant part of this form, which lies in the words *in officium et opus Sacerdotis in Ecclesiâ Dei per impositionem manuum nostrarum jam tibi commissum*,—had no place in the Anglican Ordinal for a hundred years. The form as here set before them would almost certainly be theologically sufficient, if found alongside of a true tradition of sacerdotal functions. It is not wonderful, therefore, that Dr. Döllinger should have asserted, as he is reported to have done at the Bonn Conference, to the delight of his Anglican hearers, that “the question of Anglican Orders is a purely historical one.” The compilers of this version were no doubt honest enough in giving their view of what Anglicanism is; but when their publication produces the impression that their view of Anglicanism is the only accepted one, its effect is to deceive.

Returning, however, to the English Elizabethan Prayer-book, we observe that, to prove that it used the word “priest” without a sacerdotal significance, may be objected to as proving too much; for why should it have been inserted at all if there was nothing to come of its insertion save irritation to the Protestant party? To meet this objection we must go on to show that there was a definite and tangible end in view in retaining the term, unreal though its use was. We have already to some extent anticipated our reply in what has been said above in regard to the term *sacerdos* in Haddon’s Latin Prayer-book.

It is acknowledged on all hands that the religious policy of Elizabeth and her advisers was to unite, if possible, all the various conflicting parties in the kingdom under the Royal ecclesiastical Supremacy. National unity they saw was impossible without some kind of

unity in a national religion. And to secure this they strained every nerve. They were not over-scrupulous about the means they used, and they cared little for the consistency of their own acts. Nor did they insist on unity in faith. Outward conformity by all to the national religion was what they desired ; and, with a view to comprehension, many of the burning controversies of the day were left "open questions." And they very nearly succeeded. The Catholic Bishops indeed would have no hand in the scheme, and a small number of determined Puritans from the first refused to conform. But the mass, both of clergy and people, were fairly caught in the net. Catholics were deceived by the use of the terms of the old religion, and Protestants were consoled by the assurance that it was a mere matter of words and names. We can, without difficulty, account for the mention of "priests" in Elizabeth's Prayer-book when we remember that the majority of those who used the book from 1558 to (say) 1570 were, in fact, priests, apostate priests, most of whom would not so readily have conformed had their legitimate title been withheld.

It appears to be the truth, however humiliating to Catholics, that when the Elizabethan Prayer-book was enforced, not more than one in forty of the beneficed clergy in England preferred deprivation to conformity ; though, on the other hand, it would seem that only about one in twelve actually took the oath of the Queen's Supremacy.*

* An account of the gradual establishment of Anglicanism in Elizabeth's reign will be found in "Edmund Campion, a Biography," by R. Simpson (Williams and Norgate, 1867). He points out that the ordinary Protestant estimate, which makes the number of parish priests throughout England, who refused to accept the Anglican system, only some two hundred, is based on very inadequate information. Thus, at York in 1559, out of ninety clergymen summoned, only twenty-one actually took the oath ; but of the sixty-nine others only sixteen are referred to in the lists which profess to give the names

For the commissioners appointed to administer it used the utmost discretion ; and by exercising no more than a very gentle pressure at first, and by leaving unmolested those who refused it, but were willing more or less to conform, they avoided that outbreak of opposition which stricter measures would certainly have provoked, and which must have proved fatal to the Elizabethan system while it was still in its infancy. And there were various degrees of conformity. Some threw themselves into the new system ; others unwillingly assented to it ; while others again read the English prayers in church to the conformists, after having said Mass secretly for the faithful few. They were in fact difficult times. It was commonly thought that the establishment of Protestantism would be but short-lived ; and many must have trifled with their consciences, having in view the expedience of waiting for the restoration of the old religion. Yet, in spite of the efforts made to induce the elder clergy to conform, a great number of churches had no one to serve them ; and, as it was impossible to provide new ministers fast enough, laymen with little or no education were licensed to read the Common Prayer. When Parker made his first visitation of his diocese, he found that most of his clergy were "either mechanics, or Mass-priests in disguise."

Certainly the victory was on the Protestant side ; and the utter failure of the ignoble proceedings of so many Catholics warns their descendants not to imitate their

of the recusants. Mere omission to subscribe (though not a public and explicit refusal) was very widely connived at ; and numbers of these men retained their livings and practised their religion (with some reserve) until their death, when their places were supplied by ministers of the new succession. And it must be remembered that it is the faith and practice of these last, and not the quasi-Catholic proceedings of the conforming priests, that can alone be taken to illustrate the nature and value of Anglican Orders.

example, but to look rather for a model in France or Germany in later times, should they in the future be subjected to State persecution.* Many who would gladly have lived and died in the faith, were tricked into conformity by the profession of the new Church to be served by Bishops and priests; though it is also true that numbers were fortunate enough to obtain reconciliation in the hour of death. But the Protestant party were not deceived. They knew the hollowness of the Anglican pretensions, and they heartily despised the hankering after old titles and meaningless ceremonies, which was characteristic of the Bishops at Court. They could estimate at his true value the priest *secundum ordinem Elizabeth*; they were proud of their Greek which told them that he was but an "elder," and his Bishop an "overseer;" and so they were content that, for the sake of an apparent continuity, which should secure the allegiance of the mass of the people, even the ministers of the new ordination should be officially styled "priests," for there was no fear at that time lest any of them should suppose that they were really such, in the old sense of the term.

And the word itself, as applicable to the ministers of the Establishment, fell utterly into disuse as the elder clergy died out. There is in fact no evidence that any one ordained with the Elizabethan Ordinal ever called himself "a priest," or so much as wore a stole. And when the Queen's long reign was over, and none of the old priests were left, "ministers and deacons" appeared as the inferior

* A brief narration of the noble stand made by the French Bishops and clergy, with barely any exceptions, against the schismatical "Civil Constitution" of 1790 (the acceptance of which, be it noted, involved no heretical doctrine, but only a violation of ecclesiastical order), may be found in Mr. Thompson's "Sufferings of the Church in Brittany." And the constancy of the German Catholics in our own day draws admiring comments even from the Protestant newspapers.

Orders of the Anglican clergy in the Canons of 1603, in spite of the reactionary High Church movement that was then just beginning.

The attempt to plant the Anglican system in Scotland bore the same witness to the true character of the Anglican Hierarchy. James I. saw in the doctrine of the divine right of Bishops a security for his own Royal divine right, against the levelling principles of the Presbyterians. Bishops, therefore, were "consecrated" for Scotland in 1610. There was nothing to be gained, but everything to be lost, by styling their inferior clergy "priests;" so men in Anglican Orders were now accommodately called "presbyters"—a term which we have already noted as not being Catholic at all.* If this was not an attempt to introduce into Scotland a sacerdotal Ministry under a Protestant guise (and who will assert that it was?), it was practically an admission that the Anglican clergy are not really priests at all. And this Anglo-Scotch Church, a true branch of the Church of England, existed for five-and-twenty years without so much as attempting to use a surplice or a Prayer-book, notwithstanding its Hierarchy of Bishops and presbyters. Episcopal government apart, it had nothing to distinguish it from modern Scotch Pres-

* Even the High Church edition of the Prayer-book, revised under the eye of Archbishop Laud, and destined to have been introduced into Scotland in 1637, spoke of "presbyters" and not of "priests." It made, nevertheless, a contemptible effort surreptitiously to bring in the "eastward position," a rubric directing that while reciting the words of institution the presbyter was to stand "at such a part of the holy table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands." Surely there are grounds for sympathising with the indignation of the stern Puritan dame, who on the first occasion of the book being used, hurled her stool at the Dean's head, and so led the opposition which prevented the imposition of this precious production on Scotland. High Churchmen have nevertheless a great respect for the Prayer-book of 1637, because on many points it gave the cue to the revisers of 1661. But it is really a witness to the shallowness of the Laudian revival.

byterianism ; and its history witnesses to the fact that the facilitating of the State's ecclesiastical Supremacy was anyhow at first the only *rationale* of Anglican Episcopacy, and that expediency and not principle has been the consistent guide in the selection of titles for the second order of the Anglican clergy.

The seventeenth century revival recommended the term "priest" to the Bishops and clergy themselves, and the revisers of 1661 contrived to make its use in the rubrics a little more systematic, though they only half did their work, and seem never to have grasped its true significance. But the word, as applied to the Anglican clergy, never became popular, and was again entirely forgotten until the days of Tractarianism. Great efforts, and up to a certain point successful, are now being made to bring it into use ; but there is a hollowness about the attempt. Moderate High Church clergymen prefer to describe themselves as "parish-priests," or "assistant-priests," or as "in priests' Orders," rather than simply as "priests ;" for the term is somewhat softened by the addition of a word. And the average clergyman is content to say that he is "in full Orders," and would explain away the title of "priest" if it were insisted upon as his. But meanwhile there are others, perhaps not a few, who even in Catholic countries are not ashamed by word or deed (*e.g.*, by wearing a cassock, or by fumbling over a Breviary) to assert themselves as priests before those who, as they well know, would not acknowledge the claim, if its nature were stated in full. And this suppression is in fact deception, even though the assertor may be honestly convinced that his claim is just.*

* No more than a smile need be excited by the proceedings of High Church clerical tourists, who bewilder Norman inn-keepers or Belgian sacristans by some such phrase as, *Nous sommes prêtres et catholiques, mais pas catholiques romains*,

vous savez. But the attempts they have sometimes made to “celebrate” at Catholic altars are a more serious matter. One such case has come to the writer’s knowledge on authority that he cannot well dispute ; and it testifies to the terrible laxity of principle to which men, otherwise worthy, become subject, when they are determined to shrink from no consequences which their claim to be priests involves. The Ritualist in question did succeed in obtaining permission to “say Mass ” in a Catholic Church in France ; and the unfortunate *curé*, who was thus cruelly and wickedly deceived, subsequently underwent somewhat severe ecclesiastical penalties for his negligence in not detecting the impostor ; who at least might have known that, priest or no, he would be regarded as under excommunication, and so not in a position to claim what he only obtained by fraud. And the same condemnation may with equal justice be passed on those self-styled “Catholics,” who while on a foreign tour have the audacity to go to communion in the Catholic Churches, with the full intention of returning to England and Anglicanism at the same time. Some have even ventured to go to confession, saying nothing about their ecclesiastical position. They ought to know that, unless their confession includes an abjuration of their heresy and schism, and their resolution of amendment includes a fully-formed intention to remain Roman Catholics to the end of their lives, the absolution they receive is null, while their own bad confession and subsequent communion, apart from an invincible ignorance which it is hardly possible to suppose, are two mortal sins. Happily in those Continental towns which the British tourist most frequents, priests now commonly understand the position of these men, and so are less liable to be deceived.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE SACERDOTIUM.

VI.

§ 29. *The Rejection of the Term "Altar."* Summary.

Three things are correlative in the sacerdotal system, Priesthood, Altar, and Sacrifice ; and in regard to these three the High Churchman argues, "Since we have the Priesthood, we have necessarily the other two, for they are involved in the first." But it may be replied, that you must first be quite sure of your Priesthood ; for if you are not, then the absence of Altar and Sacrifice will be a fatal objection. The last preceding section has at least thrown doubt on the reality of the Anglican Priesthood ; and the rejection of the Mass by the Church of England had already been something like demonstrated. We have now, therefore, only to confirm our argument by calling attention to the undisputed fact that since 1552 the Reformed Church has made no official claim to possess a true Altar. The word is not found in the rubrics of the Prayer-book, though it occurred of course *passim* in the Missal and Ritual, which the compilers of the Anglican rites had before them. The semi-official Coronation Service contains it, certainly (apparently because such Catholic ceremonial and language as contributed to the Royal dignity was thought worth preserving) ; but there also the religion of the Church of England is described as Protestant ; so that High Churchmen can hardly adduce the rite as a

proof of their "Catholicity." Moreover, not only was the term "altar" excluded from the Prayer-book, and so the possession of a Ministry requiring an altar implicitly repudiated; but the actual altars themselves were thrown down, and in many places the consecrated stone was either put to some common use, or else laid in the Church porch, that all who came in or out might tread upon it, and so make an act of disbelief in the Mass. And popular language has borne the same witness to the fact that the Church of England has no altar, and therefore no true *Sacerdotium*. Until recent years "the Communion table," or simply "the table," was the universally recognised designation for what High Churchmen now describe as "the altar," and moderate men as "the altar-table." Not, however, that popular language is by itself always a sure testimony. A dim uneducated tradition might have transmitted both the terms altar and priest, when the realities were gone. And, considering the efforts that were made to keep up the semblance of continuity between the old and the new religions, it is perhaps surprising that the vestiges of Catholicism should have so entirely disappeared. It is said, however, that in the remote Lake district the Anglican clergyman has all along been styled "the priest"; much as a simple child nursing her dol might say, "Poor Eddy, soon be better," when her little brother had died. And similarly, when sacerdotal doctrine has long been repudiated and forgotten, the word altar may be loosely used without any notion of sacrifice at all. Thus newspaper reports of weddings commonly speak of "the hymeneal altar"; and the breakfast table is "the family altar" in domestic worship. So that, in regard to the modern revival of the term in the Church of England, even if its use should become universal, unless there should be further evidence that the tremendous significance

of the Christian Altar is really understood, it would not go far to prove that the Anglican Church has a true Eucharistic Sacrifice.

For, indeed, as the writer has had occasion to know, Catholic words and Catholic phrases are as often as not very unreal on the lips of those who take part in the advanced High Church movement. The doctrine of the Real Presence is, no doubt, taught and accepted with tolerable distinctness, and certain aspects of the Sacrament of Penance are fully appreciated ; but "the Mass," though glibly talked about by those who frequent Ritualistic worship, is really very little understood ; nor is this remarkable when it is remembered how utterly alien from the traditional Church of England system is the whole notion of sacrifice ; and that moreover an Anglican clergyman can hardly teach his people the true doctrine of the Mass—that in it the priest offers Christ as a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and the dead—without some apparent inconsistency with his adherence to certain declarations, on the strength of which he holds his position.

On the whole, then, putting together all that has been considered as to the witness which the Church of England may be shown to have borne, or not to have borne, to sacerdotal doctrine and practice—and this concerns, it must not be forgotten, the character of the Anglican Episcopate, as well as of the Anglican Presbyterate—we conclude that the English Reformers meant by Bishop and priest something very different from what Catholics mean. Are we not justified in suspecting that they wished to be quit of the substance of the Priesthood, and yet to retain that dignity and orderliness which the names of the ancient Hierarchy denoted, and so might serve to secure ? Did they not, in fact,

intend to throw overboard the *Sacerdotium*, while yet retaining Bishops to govern priests without altar or confessional? It seems clear that such was the case; and that they actually succeeded in effecting their purpose can be proved with moral certainty, if Catholic principles are accepted, when the Anglican Ordinal is compared with that from which it is supposed to have been derived. They would give up the Order of Priesthood, but keep the nominal ranks of Bishop and priest.

Now, if this be a just account of the Ministry devised by the Tudors for the National Church, it is needless to say that such Orders, whatever might be their value with reference to their own community, would be in relation to the Catholic Priesthood absolutely null. Bishops and priests without the *Sacerdotium* are but laymen in Catholic eyes. It is as if some prince should say, "I will have an army, with officers and rank and file, but none of them shall be soldiers; for I am a man of peace, and regard war as sin. My army then shall be an army, but shall never fight; they shall have no drill, and bear no arms, and wear no uniform; I shall be satisfied if they are 'decently habited'; and their sole occupation shall be to make roads." Such warriors, even if, against the protest of their commanding officers, they succeeded in performing some amateur military exercises with wooden swords and mediæval armour, could not justly take it as a grievance if genuine soldiers declined to acknowledge them as comrades.

§ 30. *Contrast between the Catholic and Anglican Rites for Ordaining a Priest.*

Since the Sarum and the modern Roman forms for priestly ordination are substantially the same, we prefer, in contrasting the Anglican Ordinal with the Catholic Pontifical, to take the latter rather than the former into consideration, noting, however, any variation that might be claimed as significant ; for the Roman rite is living and vigorous, and in use in all parts of the world, whereas the Sarum, however beautiful and interesting as a witness to the faith of Old England, is now the property of liturgical students and of antiquarians, rather than of Catholics as such.

In the Catholic rite, then, for the ordination of a priest, the Bishop in his address to the ordinands places first among the duties of the office they are to receive, the offering of Sacrifice :—*Sacerdotem etenim oportet offerre, benedicere, præesse, prædicare et baptizare*. A little later he speaks of their being called *mortis Dominicæ mysterium celebrare*. Then he, and after him as many priests as are present, severally lay their hands on the candidates in silence. Next, while both the Bishop and the priests assisting extend their hands over those who receive the Order, he says a prayer, at the commencement of which occur the words *super hos famulos tuos benedictionem Sancti Spiritûs et gratiæ sacerdotalis** *infunde virtutem*. This prayer, which is commonly known as the Consecration (a name significant of its grave importance, and

* The Sarum Pontifical here had *spiritualis*; but Exeter and Winchester agreed with the Roman. In either case the reference is the same,—to the sacramental grace of the Order then being conferred.

consequently of the extreme peril of its omission), is continued at some length in the form of a Preface, and throughout it the Bishop keeps his hands extended over the candidates. Some regard this as a second imposition of hands ; but it is better to consider the whole act as one, the imposition in silence being the application to each individual of that which is to follow.* At the conclusion of the prayer the Bishop invests each with stole and chasuble.

Now this "laying on of hands with prayer" is that portion of the rite which has come down from immemorial antiquity, and is found, though with the prayer in a somewhat less developed form, both in the East and in the most ancient Sacramentaries of the West. Many theologians hold that *per se* it constitutes the actual ordination, and all agree that the Roman rite would now be invalidated by its omission. In the West, some thousand or so years ago, other features were added (which we proceed to notice), and these, where they have the warrant of tradition and authority, could not be omitted without throwing such grave doubt on the validity of the whole act as to necessitate its repetition *sub conditione*. They illustrate and confirm in detail the various sacerdotal powers which have probably been already conferred by the imposition of hands. They are in fact a kind of efflorescence of that act, and they cannot be dissociated from it without endangering its integrity. And, whatever may be their

* De Lugo thus explains the *moralis conjunctio* which exists between the silent imposition of hands and the imposition without touch to which the prayer called *Consecratio* is attached :—"Non ita distat manûs impositio à formæ prolatione, quæ postea subsequitur, ut non censeantur habere propinquitatem moralem sufficientem ; neque enim debet esse cœexistentia physica, ut constat in Diaconis, quibus dicitur forma omnibus simul, et postea successivè tangunt librum . . . sic etiam postquam imponuntur manus Sacerdotibus, usque ad illa verba, *Accipe potestatem*, &c., eadem actio moralis continuatur," &c. See Ballerini's edition of Gury, vol. ii. p. 129.

sacramental efficacy, their external effect is certainly to bring the Catholic rite into striking correspondence with the gradual ordination of the Apostles by our Lord ; for they, as we have already seen, received at one time their commission to baptise ; at another, power to offer the Holy Sacrifice,—*Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* ;—and later still authority to absolve,—*Accipite Spiritum Sanctum ; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittuntur eis*.*

Thus, after the imposition of hands, the new priest's hands are anointed ; and then he touches the paten and chalice, in which are the elements prepared for consecration, while the Bishop says, *Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis : in nomine Domini*. This ceremony is the celebrated "tradition of the instruments," which the Schoolmen generally held to be the essential matter and form of priestly ordination. And from this point the newly-ordained "concelebrates" with the Bishop, that is, says aloud with him all the Canon of the Mass, including the words of consecration, and thus exercises for the first

* The writer of the article in the *Church Quarterly* is singularly bold in his criticism of the Roman Pontifical. He thinks the Catholic rites are "clumsy." "The whole form for ordaining priests is in the very utmost confusion ; full of beautiful elements thrown together with a want of harmony and arrangement which actually involves serious doctrinal misstatement." This last accusation is based on the fact that in the rubrics the candidate is styled *ordinandus* and not *ordinatus* until after the "tradition of the instruments." On this the writer observes, "If the moderns be right that the second (better called the first) imposition of hands makes the priest, it is *nothing less than a denial of her own Orders by the Church of Rome* that she should afterwards call him *ordinandus*." The truth is that the Church does not regard her ordination as a momentary and almost magical act, like the passage of an electric spark ; but, in accordance with the principles stated by De Lugo, as a whole, extending from the silent imposition of hands to the touching of the chalice and paten. The act is complete when this has been done ; but while it is in progress, *ordinandus* is the more correct word to use than *ordinatus* ; for it may be regarded as taking the place of a present passive participle ; and etymology would bear out this view.

time, but in subordination to the Bishop, the sacrificial office that he has received. Towards the close of the ceremony he kneels once more before the Bishop, who lays both hands on his head, saying, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum : quorum remiseric peccata remittuntur eis ; et quorum retinueris retenta sunt.* Finally the Bishop admonishes him to learn how to say Mass from other priests, before he ventures to do so himself ; and he bids him say three for special intentions, so soon as he conveniently may. Such is a brief sketch of the glorious rite by which the Catholic Church has, for about a thousand years, ordained her priests.

And how much of all this were the English Reformers pleased to retain ? A single glance at their Ordinal reveals the striking contrast. Preferring the letter of Scripture to its spirit, which lives and breathes in the Catholic Church, they kept only the last imposition of hands, which has a literally Scriptural form ; and this they transferred to the place of the first.

Now, as has been already pointed out, this feature is not primitive. In the Catholic rite, the Priesthood has already been conferred before it takes place. No doubt when once there it could not be omitted without grave irregularity ; but this is a very different thing from saying that it is by itself sufficient to confer the Priesthood. Indeed this last position is directly contradicted, so far as an ostensible use of the Latin rite is concerned, by Catholic theology. St. Alphonsus quotes with approval Lacroix, who states (and adduces a decision of the Sacred Congregation of rites under Benedict XIV. to the same effect), that if at an ordination the second imposition of hands (which we have regarded as part of the first) should have accidentally been omitted, the whole ceremony (though it include the final imposition, with the form

Accipe Spiritum Sanctum) is null, and must be repeated *ab initio* ; whereas, if this last have been omitted, it may be supplied later, and there is no need for any repetition. And the reason he gives seems to be unimpeachable—viz., that he who has not received the principal sacerdotal function, power over the true Body of Christ, is unable to receive the minor function, power over Christ's mystical Body, to absolve the penitent from sin ; whereas, on the other hand, the minor office would necessarily, at least *in potentiâ*, be included under the major.* In other words, if the sacrificial Priesthood be duly conferred by imposition of hands with prayer, according to the universal tradition, the power to absolve would be granted at the same time, even though its bestowal were not, as in the Catholic rite, illustrated and confirmed by a special form ; but if a reversal of the procedure were attempted, and the power to offer sacrifice expected to come in as it were by a side wind, as a kind of corollary to the power to absolve, the result would be an invalid ordination. Such at least is the teaching of grave theologians ; and since it remains unchallenged, it could not in practice be set aside.

And, if the Church places such restrictions on herself, it is vain to imagine that what in her hands would not suffice, could be made effectual at the heretical will of Cranmer or of Parker. The Catholic rites are no mere dead documents, but living things ; and if in the course of ages they put forth new leaves and blossoms, they still remain one with their former selves, and one in their acts and effects. And so, again, if the Church herself hesitates to decide what are and what are not the essentials and non-essentials in her rites, it must surely be perilous in

* St. Alphonsus, Theol. Moral., Lib. vi. cap. 5, § 749.

the extreme for those who have forsaken her fold to appropriate this or that fragment, and boastfully to assert that all else is superfluous.

It is hardly too much to say that at this point the controversy might really be concluded on theological grounds, and that the Anglican claim to be in possession of the Catholic Priesthood, if judged by the principles of Catholic theology (and, it must be repeated, there are no other principles by which such a claim can be judged), really breaks down when the Anglican form for ordaining priests, as used between 1552 and 1662, is brought into court. At least it is clear that Catholics can never allow more than a possibility that Anglican Orders may be maintained. A probability, such as could be followed in practice, is certainly out of the question. And the present writer is satisfied that the evidence that has already been adduced is sufficient to produce a moral conviction of their invalidity.

But it will, no doubt, have been observed that this rejection is here based on an acceptance of the principles common to theologians in regard to the use of the Church's own rites ; and that we have for the moment left out of account that peculiar view, which for the sake of argument we professed our readiness to entertain—viz., that a form that has in any case been allowed as sufficient, must be allowed to suffice in every case, provided that it be really the same. An examination of the relevance of this opinion to the question before us will somewhat prolong our discussion ; still it may be hoped that this prolixity will not be unattended with advantage ; for a claim like that made on behalf of Anglican Orders, which has for some time been stoutly maintained, and is at the present moment especially vigorous in action, will not be easily laid aside by even one of its upholders, unless all that

seems to tell in its favour be examined, and be shown unequal to the stress laid upon it. The Anglican Ordinal must therefore undergo a more detailed criticism, that we may make sure of not having mistaken its true character ; and then the bearing on the controversy of a certain decision about Abyssinian Orders must be considered, which will suggest some further remarks on the irrelevance of parallel cases which have been urged in support of the Anglican claim.

§ 31. *Further Examination of the Anglican Rite for the Ordination of a Priest.*

We have already asserted that, apart from the term "priest" and the Scriptural form, "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c., the Anglican Ordinal contains nothing suggestive of sacerdotal doctrine. We have, moreover, estimated the force of these two expressions as illustrated by the Prayer-book services in general, and by the practical working of the Anglican system. We now proceed to notice that their surroundings in the rite of which they form a part equally preclude their being interpreted in the Catholic sense.

No part of the Prayer-book has so little in common with the ancient Catholic ritual as the Ordinal. And this is especially true of "The Form of Ordering Priests." The ceremony was to take place in the course of "the Communion;" the *Veni Creator* was to be said or sung; and a portion of the form used at the imposition of hands was the same as that employed as a supplemental form in the Sarum Pontifical. But there was no further resemblance. The prayers, exhortations, and examination "in the name of the Congregation," were all entirely new, and were moreover distinctly Protestant in tone. Two portions of Scripture were selected for the Epistle—it must be borne in mind that we are referring throughout to the Ordinal used in the sixteenth century—one from the Acts, which spoke of the "elders" or "overseers of the Congregation" at Ephesus; and the other from the first Epistle to Timothy; in which, by means of an ingenious variation in the translation of the word *διάκονος*, the three Anglican Orders of "Bishops, Ministers, and

Deacons" were made to appear. For the Gospel, three passages were given for selection—the concluding verses of St. Matthew, which would indicate the Ministry as commissioned to teach and baptise; our Lord's announcement of his office as the Good Shepherd; and finally the account of his appearance to the Apostles on Easter evening, when the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c., were spoken—the Scriptural character of the form about to be used being thus vindicated. Except in the title prefixed to the rite, the word "Priest" was not used at all; but the expressions, "Order," "holy Office," and "Ministry of Priesthood," specified the ecclesiastical position to which the candidates were to be "admitted;" and that that position was the Priesthood in the Catholic sense there was nothing whatever to show.

The charge on the duties of the Anglican priestly office made mention neither of sacrifice nor of absolution. The latter perhaps need not have been looked for, since neither does the Catholic Ordinal speak of it distinctly.* Indeed it belongs strictly to the office of High Priest or Bishop; a fact which may account for the lateness of the addition of the form indicating the absolving power to the Catholic rite for the ordination of a priest. But, since the Anglican claim to the possession of the Catholic Priesthood can only be defended on the ground of the retention of this form with the view of continuing the succession of absolving priests, some allusion to this onerous duty might perhaps have reasonably been expected; but there is none to be found. The charge in question (said to have been the composition of Bucer) has no doubt great merits as a piece of English composition on the Scriptural model;

* The term *præesse* is, however, commonly accepted as indicating that aptitude or discharging the judicial function of confessor, which priestly ordination confers.

but as a definition of the Priesthood it has none. None, if it is really the *Sacerdotium* that is about to be conferred ; for there is absolutely no mention of its distinctive characteristics. We look in vain for any such expressions as, "You are called to offer sacrifice," "to celebrate the divine mysteries," "to absolve penitents," or "to bless." Putting together the charge and the subsequent public examination we find that the Anglican priest is "to teach," "to premonish," "to feed," "to provide for," "to seek," and "to minister the doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same." The titles of messenger, watchman, steward, pastor, and minister are all used as explanatory of the priestly office, and in place of the term priest, which does not occur. The prayer immediately preceding the imposition of hands defines the Priesthood as "the Office and Ministry of the salvation of mankind ;" and regards it as the same as that which Christ entrusted to his Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Doctors, and Pastors.

Now, some of these expressions have, no doubt, an orthodox sound, and are quite capable of a Catholic interpretation. They show clearly that, whatever may be said as to the perverted official intention by which the proceedings of the Reformers were guided, they had a generally good intention to continue in the Reformed Church the Ministry ordained by Christ. And, in particular, the words above noted, "to minister the doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded," are such as might fairly be allowed, did they stand alone, to include all the functions of the Catholic Priesthood, save only the principal one of offering sacrifice.

But in the Anglican Ordinal they have a clause attached to them, rendering so orthodox an interpretation impossible :

—"as this Church and Realm hath received the same." The use of the singular verb "hath" with the two substantives "Church and Realm" should here first be noted. It may be a mere slip, but it is at least a tenable supposition that the form of expression is deliberate and significant. The absolute identity of Church and State, the theory that the Church was but the Realm in its religious aspect, and was nothing apart from it,—these were views much favoured by the Anglican Reformers, and formed the basis on which the new national religion was built. They were elaborately expounded by Hooker in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*; and it was the rejection of them which justified Elizabeth's persecution of both Catholics and Puritans as traitors. For, indeed, they who established Anglicanism in the sixteenth century had no belief in "the Church" in the sense in which High Churchmen now employ the term. They favoured no "branch theory," they had no idea of their national Church being spiritually joined to "the rest of the Western Church" by an "invisible unity." They would have indignantly scouted the notion that it was in any way connected with the kingdom of Anti-christ. But on the other hand they unhesitatingly taught that it was intimately connected, was perhaps identical, with the English State. They were in fact thorough Erastians; and there is nothing extravagant in suggesting that they spoke of Church-and-Realm as of an indivisible entity, and therefore rightly to be used with a singular verb.* And the justice of this interpretation would be further illustrated

* It appears, however, that the word "Church" was added to this sentence by the revisers of 1661. As they certainly believed in the Church as distinct from the State, the use of the singular verb must be regarded as merely a slip. The Elizabethan Prayer-book (as also the Edwardine) had not shrunk from the naked Erastianism of claiming from the candidates for the Anglican Priesthood that they should profess Christianity "as this Realm hath received the same."

by the latter part of the form of Anglican ordination, as used in Elizabeth's reign. After the imposition of hands, the Bishop gave the ordained a Bible, saying, "Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments *in this Congregation* where thou shalt be so appointed." The word "Congregation" is here used, as it was also in the Ordinal of 1549, in the sense of "Church." Such was its common signification with the Protestants of that day. "This Congregation" therefore meant "this national Church of England;" whence it would follow that the Elizabethan Bishops, in using this rite, had merely in view the ordination of what we may term "national priests," *i.e.*, men whose Priesthood should have relation to the national community, and not to the Church at large.*

The significance of this clause, whether it stand "as this Church and Realm," or, more shamelessly still, "as this Realm hath received the same," is therefore clear. Practically the Church of England thus addressed and addresses the candidates for her Priesthood:—"In coming to me to receive this commission, you acknowledge that I, as 'this Church of England,' *i.e.*, as a community distinct from the rest of Christendom, under the guidance of 'this Realm' (which is perhaps my very self, anyhow is *maxima pars mei*), have rightly judged what are and what are not the Sacraments of Christ, and how they ought to be administered and received. And you accept, moreover, our version

* The High Church revisers of 1661, by the addition of a clause, and by the substitution of "the" for "this," ingeniously gave to the Anglican form a wider and therefore a new significance. They bade the Bishop say, "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God*," words which were no doubt intended to indicate the Catholicity of the Priesthood supposed to be conferred; and "the Congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto," however odd an expression, was no longer applicable to the national Church as a whole, but to the particular flock to which the new priest would have to minister.

of Christ's doctrine and discipline." To make "*this* Church," and not "*the* Church," the interpreter of the Christian religion, is by itself a mark of schism ; and to unite with it in that office "this Realm," is unmistakable Erastianism, that is, heresy. Had this qualifying clause been absent, which really subordinates the institutions of Christ to the interpretation put upon them by the national Church, "to minister the discipline of Christ" would naturally have seemed to refer to the Sacrament of Penance ; but we have already ascertained at length that no such explanation will hold. Similarly, "to minister the Sacraments of Christ" might have been pressed so as to indicate the celebration of the Holy Eucharist as the principal function of an Anglican priest. But we have seen that "this Church and Realm" rejected its sacrificial character, ignored its being the vehicle for the Divine Presence, and even withheld from it this very name of Holy Eucharist, so resolute were they in excluding everything that could possibly suggest that the Anglican Priesthood was ordained to offer sacrifice. True it is that his ordination qualifies the Anglican priest to take the principal part in the "administration of the Lord's Supper ;" but it is also true that this function is not entrusted to him as his special and most important work, as, on the other hand, the Catholic priest is ordained to say Mass. The Anglican clergyman, so far from being called upon to administer the Communion frequently, has difficulties thrown in his way by the rubrics at the end of the service, should he desire to do so, but have only a few people under his care. For the rite is not to be performed unless a certain number of communicants (bearing in the case specified a very large proportion to the actual population), present themselves to receive it ; as is the rule with other Protestant bodies. And, if he be not the chief

minister of the church he serves, he may, and often does, go on for years without so much as once "taking the Communion Service ;" and yet, all the while, no one would hold that he was unfaithful to the duties of his Priesthood. Even Edward's First Prayer-book contemplated only a single administration on the same day in the same church ; for, where there were many priests, they were not to "celebrate" every Sunday, but merely to "receive the Communion with the priest." There is here further evidence of the rejection of the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as early as 1549. No doubt, according to the modern High Church system, the younger generation of Anglican clergymen may imitate with tolerable accuracy the functions of Catholic priests in relation to the Holy Eucharist ; and a good deal may be said even by "moderate men " in favour of the propriety and expediency of "frequent celebrations ;" but the fact remains that their language and practice are alien from the spirit of the Prayer-book, even in its least Protestant editions of 1549 and 1662.

We submit, then, that an examination of the Anglican ordination rite itself confirms the conclusion to which our appeal to the other Anglican services and to the ordinary practice of the Anglican clergy had pointed us, viz., that there was never meant to be any sacerdotal character in an Anglican priest which he should not share with Scotch presbyters and Lutheran pastors. He may differ from them in his official name, perhaps also in social position, in culture, and in tone, Frequently in the present day he differs from them widely in theological bias. But the Ministry conferred upon him does not differ substantially from theirs.

"To what end, then, do you retain the bare title of priest ?" a Catholic may ask the Church of England. "You bid him do no more than 'administer the Lord's

Supper ;' and the Lutherans, who make no pretence to have the Priesthood, do the same. Why, moreover, do you give to the Holy Eucharist this unusual name ? Have you forgotten that it is not a Sacrament only, but also a Sacrifice ? and that the offering of this Sacrifice is the principal function of a priest ? You are silent : but your silence is not that of ignorance, or even of mere forgetfulness. It is the silence of denial, of repudiation, and of heretical rejection. You called your ministers priests only to deceive the people. Your Priesthood is like that of Jeroboam, founded for a political purpose. Those admitted to it are not of the sons of Levi. ' You have cast out the priests of the Lord, the sons of Aaron and the Levites ; and you have made you priests like all the nations of the earth. . . . But the Lord is our God, whom we forsake not ; and the priests who minister to the Lord are the sons of Aaron ; and the Levites are in their Order. And they offer holocausts to the Lord every day, morning and evening, and incense made according to the ordinance of the Law ; and the loaves are set forth on a most clean table ; and there is with us the golden candlestick, and the lamps thereof, to be lighted always in the evening ; for we keep the precepts of the Lord our God, whom you have forsaken. . . . O children of Israel, fight not against the Lord God of your fathers, for it is not good for you.' "

§ 32. *The Alleged Parallel of the Abyssinian Form.*

Canon Estcourt certainly cannot be accused of having kept in the background facts that might at first sight seem to tell against his arguments and conclusion. He has brought into the full light of day an answer of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, which was given in 1704, and confirmed in 1860, admitting the validity of a certain ordination of priests among the schismatic Abyssinians, in which only the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* were used with the imposition of hands. This decision had hitherto been little known to Catholics, nor had any Anglican writer referred to it; indeed, only a painstaking student of the theology of Holy Order was likely to have come across it. Now, however, that Canon Estcourt has made it known, the upholders of the Anglican theory insist upon it as decisive in their favour. We must therefore inquire what bearing it has upon our controversy.

Of course, if the principle were admitted that what suffices for a valid ordination under certain special circumstances of time or place, is not therefore certainly sufficient under other circumstances not the same, there would be little need to discuss this Abyssinian decision. But, since we have, under protest, accepted the position that what suffices anywhere must suffice everywhere, we are bound to examine a case which seems to be a real precedent by which the Anglican form should be favourably judged. And our contention will be that, in spite of the apparent identity of the two cases, there is really no parallel between them, and that the act of ordination in either case was by no means the same.

It was stated in the case laid by the Catholic missionaries in Abyssinia before the Sacred Congregation that the schismatical Abuna, or Archbishop, apparently only on one particular occasion, declined to ordain priests until he had some thousands of candidates. When these had been obtained, they were arranged in ranks in the church, and the Abuna, passing rapidly along the line, imposed his hands on each, saying *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. So great was the hurry and confusion that some were missed altogether, others could not make sure whether in their own case the form had actually been used or no ; while others, on the contrary, in spite of the irreverence of the proceedings, were certainly recipients both of the matter and of the form of this ordination. Some of these last were reconciled to the Catholic Church ; and hence arose the occasion for consulting the Sacred Congregation ; and in reply their ordination was admitted to be valid, and they were to act as priests, using, of course, their own peculiar rites, without even conditional ordination. Hence it is clear that under certain circumstances the use of no other words than *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* in conjunction with the imposition of hands is admitted to secure a valid ordination to the Priesthood. Nor were those circumstances altogether favourable to the validity of the act ; for the words in question were no part of the traditional Abyssinian form, and the Abuna appears to have used them solely on his own responsibility ; while the actual ceremony itself, according to the report of the missionaries, was a mere scene of confusion.

A great deal may be said on this decision of the Inquisition ; and those who care to study the question will find much that is interesting and instructive in Canon Estcourt's treatise (pp. 188-195, and Append. xxxiv. and xxxv.), in some letters addressed by Father Jones, S.J., to the

“Month” (Nov. and Dec. 1873, and Jan. and Feb. 1874), and in the American “Catholic World” (vol. xix. pp. 616–621). But no one can with safety apply the decision off-hand to the case of Anglican ordinations, without some acquaintance with the circumstances under which the matter and form were used in either case ; unless, indeed, he should adopt that position already protested against as inconsistent with Catholic principles—viz., that in the administration of Sacraments words and acts have a power of their own, apart from, and even in opposition to, the known intention of the officiant, so that the mere syllables which suffice in one case must necessarily suffice in every other, without regard being had to the sense in which they are employed.

That the Sacred Congregation gave the decision we are now considering not without some considerable knowledge of the surroundings of the Abyssinian rite, may be gathered with tolerable certainty from the facts that (1) since the sixteenth century Catholic missionaries, notably from among the Jesuits, had been active in Abyssinia, and had continually kept up communication with the Holy See ; that (2) several learned works on the various Coptic rituals and liturgies had been put forth by Catholics before 1704, some of them having been published in Rome itself ; and that (3) the Uniate Abyssinians had a church of their own in Rome, wherein, no doubt, they were privileged to use their peculiar rites.

It should be noticed, moreover, that the question before the Congregation did not concern the validity of Abyssinian Orders in general. This was implicitly acknowledged in the interrogation of the missionaries, and had, no doubt, been time after time acknowledged in practice on the submission of schismatical Abyssinian priests to the Catholic Vicar-Apostolic. If the Abyssinian rite in itself

and as ordinarily performed was regarded as invalid, the succession would have been extinct long before 1704. But the Abuna was clearly allowed to be a true Bishop ; and the question was whether the Orders conferred by him on a particular occasion, amid circumstances of peculiar irreverence, could be allowed as valid.*

And then, again, it must be pointed out that, however irregular were the proceedings of the schismatical Abuna, which called for the decision of the Sacred Congregation, the words actually laid before the Inquisitors in the interrogation itself do not constitute the whole of the Coptic form. The missionaries gave only the words which synchronized with the physical imposition of hands, and said nothing about the prayers which the Coptic rite contains, wherein occur expressions implying, though somewhat feebly, the true doctrine of the Christian Priesthood. And on the occasion referred to the Abuna would presumably have celebrated Mass according to the Coptic rite, would have explicitly as well as implicitly intended to ordain his numerous candidates to the end of their offering the Holy Sacrifice, and would have used with that intention the prayers contained in his Pontifical, which would thus have had a *moralis conjunctio* with his imposition of hands. So that the rapid act itself, accompanied by the brief form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, need not be regarded as more than the application to each individual of the whole act of ordination, similar to, if not the same as, the silent imposition of hands which we have noted at the

* This consideration at once places the Abyssinian interrogation on a different platform from the case above referred to of Dr. Gordon, Bishop of Glasgow, which came before the same Congregation a week later. In his petition it was implied that his consecrators were no true Bishops ; and there was already in possession at Rome a tradition to that effect. There was therefore no real parallel between the two cases, though there was a singular coincidence of form.

beginning of the Roman rite. And in that case the use of the words (on which alone can Anglicans base any application of the decision to their own ordinations) may be looked upon as in itself indifferent. If the Abyssinian custom had been to impose hands in silence, and if the Abuna had adhered to that custom, it is by no means clear that the Sacred Congregation would have judged less favourably of his act; though, on the other hand, the omission of the words in individual cases, where the Abuna had intended (even if only on that particular occasion) to use them as a sacramental formula applied to each person whom he ordained, would probably have nullified his act wherever the omission occurred,—anyhow it would have justified the missionaries in seeking advice from Rome.

In short, there is nothing magical about the words "Receive the Holy Ghost" which should make them everywhere and under all circumstances confer the *Sacerdotium* when joined with the imposition of hands. As has already been pointed out, a Bishop might give his blessing in this way, or he might confirm, according to his intention; though a Catholic Bishop could not lawfully do so, since he has other words and acts prescribed. In no part of the Church is there any tradition of the primitive and continuous use of this form to confer either the Priesthood or the Episcopate. The date of its introduction in the West is approximately known; but it is not there more than a supplementary form; nor does any theologian hold that in the Roman rite it confers *per se* the Sacrament of Holy Order. How the Abyssinian Abuna came to use it is a mystery, for it does not occur in his liturgical books. Father Jones has suggested that the report of the missionaries to Rome contained a mis-translation, and that the words he really used were *Reple eum Spiritu Sancto*, which are found in one of the prayers

in the Coptic Pontifical. But this is a mere conjecture ; and, on the other hand, the writer in the " Catholic World " is strongly of opinion that the report of the missionaries was perfectly accurate, and that the Abyssinians had learnt the form in question from long association with Catholics. If this be so, it is clear that its use was a deliberate approximation to the Roman rite, and so was rather calculated to give additional strength to the act of ordination.

It would appear, then, that there is no real parallel between the Anglican form for the ordination of a priest, and that portion of the Abyssinian form (if it is to be accounted such) which was submitted to the judgment of the Sacred Congregation. That the same words occur in both cases is a remarkable coincidence, certainly ; perhaps an interesting one ; but it can be accounted nothing more. There is nothing to show that in the Anglican rite they bear the same sense as they did in the Abyssinian case ; indeed, there is very much to show that they do not. And if this be so, the mere identity of words, when there is no identity of meaning, comes to nothing. In the latter case, the form was employed with the imposition of hands to apply to each candidate the actual ordination, which contemplated their being consecrated and set apart to offer the Holy Sacrifice ; whereas, in the former case, the use of the same words cannot safely be accounted a sacramental act at all ; and certainly they were not employed in Elizabeth's reign with any intention, either public or implicit, of ordaining *sacerdotes* in the Catholic sense. Thus (apart from the further objection, which, though temporarily waived, is not to be entirely set aside, that what is tolerated in the East is not on that account sufficient in the West, when the rest of the Western rite is omitted) the one case is not really a precedent by which the other can be judged. And the decision itself, of which so much

has latterly been made, has now been declared no formal decree of the Inquisition—*i.e.*, it is not to be accounted as final and of universal application—while it is also stated, on the same high authority, that it did not profess to make any pronouncement as to what is *in se* sufficient matter and form for conferring the Priesthood, but merely decided that in the particular case the validity of the Abuna's ordination was to be allowed.*

* See Cardinal Patrizi's letter to Cardinal Manning, dated April 30th, 1875, and reprinted in Breen's "Anglican Orders, are they Valid?" p. 43.

§ 33. *Another Parallel to the Composition of the Anglican Form.*

So far as the writer is aware, no other mode of ordination, admitted as valid, can more plausibly be adduced as a precedent for the Anglican form than the case considered in the last section above, wherein reasons have been given for regarding as irrelevant to our subject the decision of the Sacred Congregation concerning a certain Abyssinian ordination. No other rites witness less distinctly to the scope of Holy Orders than those employed by the semi-barbarous communities which represent the ancient Christian Churches of Egypt and the adjoining countries. For example, in the usual Greek rite for the ordination of a priest, there are features which practically amount to the "tradition of the instruments," since they distinctly specify the intention with which the "laying on of hands with prayer" is performed. For, while that action is in progress, the rubric directs the ordinand to rest his head against the altar, on which the Holy Sacrifice is prepared ; and later, the Holy Bread is placed in his hands by the Bishop (not for communion), with words implying that the custody of the Holy Eucharist is the main function of that office which has been conferred upon him. No doubt, the Coptic rites fall considerably short of this; but still, into whatever ignorance or corruptions the schismatical Churches using those rites may have lapsed, not a little in consequence of their separation from Rome, the heart of Christendom, there has never prevailed among them any heresy on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and they have consistently ordained their priests with the sacrificial office in view.

Such orthodox intention being supposed, the details of matter and form, which, in accordance with immemorial tradition, they employ, are of less importance ; and it is undeniable that the Church judges their rites with a generosity to which her own children in the West are necessarily strangers.

Anglicans may be disposed to complain of this generosity, not merely as an inconsistency, but as seriously endangering the continuity of the ministerial succession. They should, however, bear in mind that the Church is better qualified than they are to judge of the prudence of her own actions, and that, in fact, her decisions are not made hastily, nor without careful adherence to long-established principles. But their disposition thus to complain, if so it be, will render them all the more ready to view with satisfaction the stringency of the Church's requirements in the West, with which they are themselves more nearly concerned.

Canon Estcourt places in juxtaposition with the Abyssinian decision a decision given by the Sacred Congregation of the Council, and referred to by Benedict XIV., to the effect that a Catholic ordination to the Priesthood, complete in all respects save that the "tradition of the instruments" was accidentally omitted, should be repeated in full *sub conditione*. This is significant of the jealousy with which the Church protects every detail of her sacramental ritual, wherever under her fostering care its expressiveness has been fully developed, and has in practice become wedded to the divine truths she teaches. The point is important, and, though it has been already insisted upon, it deserves further illustration.

Suppose that the Gallican spirit, which unhappily prevailed in France during the last century, had acquired such strength as to have resulted in the separation of the

national Church from Catholic unity. Suppose that thereupon a schismatical Council of the Church of France had assembled, which, while disclaiming any attempt to make a change in faith, had decided, "with the view of consolidating the recovery of their ancient independence of the See of Rome, to restore their ordination rites to their primitive simplicity." We may consider three proposals that might have been made, from which three distinct results would have followed, according to that which the Council adopted :—

1. They might have omitted the final imposition of hands with the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, &c., as being an unnecessary mediæval addition. A priest thus ordained, and afterwards reconciled to the Roman Church, would be acknowledged as a priest, but the ceremony omitted would need to be supplied.

2. They might on the same grounds have omitted the "tradition of the instruments," and nothing else. In accordance with the decision noted above, a priest thus ordained would have had to be re-ordained *sub conditione*.

3. But if, in ignorance or disregard of antiquity, they had omitted the first imposition of hands with the prayer called *Consecratio*, and had begun the ceremony with the unction, retaining, however, the rest of the rite intact, it appears certain that the whole would have been regarded as null, so that the priestly character of a convert thus ordained would not have been recognised ; and, did he wish to act as a priest in the Catholic Church, he would have had to submit to unconditional ordination.

We are supposing the Church in acting thus to be guided by the opinion of her theologians whose treatises on the Sacrament of Holy Order had obtained the widest and fullest acceptance. Had the events we have imagined taken place in the sixteenth century instead of in the

eighteenth, that is to say, contemporaneously with the proceedings of the Anglican Reformers, and before the writings of such men as Martène and Morinus had appeared, who threw so much light on the ancient ritual of the Church, and gave such weight to universal and primitive tradition,—when, in fact, the opinion of the Schoolmen (*e.g.*, Durandus, Hugh of St. Victor, and Peter Lombard), on the essentials of Holy Order would have had to be followed in practice, since there was none else to which appeal could be made,—unconditional ordination would no doubt have been required in the second case given above, as well as in the third. And, since the guilt of the rejection of details of matter and form, whether by individuals or by a local Church, would be great in proportion to the strength of the testimony by which the necessity of those details was insisted on, it is clear that no defence can on Catholic principles be made of the proceedings of Cranmer and those who assisted him in compiling the Anglican Ordinal; for they, no doubt of set purpose, rejected what the Schoolmen unanimously taught was absolutely necessary for the ordination of a Catholic priest, and in the Scholastic theology they had themselves been trained, nor was there any other recognised by the Church, which they could profess to take as their guide.

§ 34. *Courayer's Defence of the Anglican Ordinal.*

If the course of our argument has been followed thus far, it will be admitted that it is an error to regard the administration of the Sacrament of Holy Order as a mere mechanical act, made up of the physical contact of the hands of the Bishop with the head of the ordinand, while simultaneously certain words are pronounced, no matter in what sense. Such a view is degrading to the sacramental institutions of Christ; it is inconsistent with their being an essentially "reasonable service;" and it reduces the form of a Sacrament to the level of a mere abracadabra or spell. On the other hand, Catholics, of course, have no thought of denying the absolute necessity of certain acts and certain words, employed with a certain intention, to effect a valid Sacrament. No mere good will, nor formal agreement between Bishop and candidate, can suffice to make a priest. Since the act is a Sacrament, it must have matter and form; and these are by common consent the laying on of hands with prayer.

Now "prayer" in this connection may fairly be taken in a wide sense. It may mean more than supplication; indeed, if it may not, the Anglican form cannot be maintained, for it uses no such prayer in conjunction with the imposition of hands. We will allow, however, that the forms of all the Sacraments may be described as "prayers," in so far as they contemplate the imparting of sacramental grace. But, on the other hand, words which convey no more than bare exhortation, or are a grant of mere external authority, and not of spiritual power, have not this character, and so are no prayer, nor can they constitute a valid form. Tournely thus states the principle on which

this distinction is based :—*Verba Sacramentorum verè ac propriè consecratoria sunt, non promissoria nec concionalia*.*

And, taking this principle as our guide, we observe that we can distinguish the Anglican form into two parts, one of which may be described as a “prayer” in the wide sense, since it consists of words capable of being used as *consecratoria*; while the other part could not claim this character, and so could have no sacramental efficiency. The imperative form, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c., might fairly be described as a “prayer,” and so as a valid form, if the words were used as conveying a true consecration; but they would not have this character or force, if they were used as an exhortation, or as a promise of a mere *grace d'état*. In no case, however, could the latter part of the form, “Be thou a faithful dispenser,” &c., or the concluding paragraph, “Take thou authority,” &c., be described as *verba consecratoria*; the words are clearly no more than *concionalia et promissoria*, and have no reference to any *virtus sacramentalis*.† The validity of

* “De Sac. in Gen.,” Quæst. I., Art. IV.

† This has an important application to the validity of the existing Orders in the Anglo-American Church. The Prayer-book of the Protestant Episcopalians, (used since 1789), not only omits the Athanasian Creed and the authoritative form of absolution, but provides an alternative form to be used at discretion in place of the words “Receive the Holy Ghost,” &c. The form thus allowed for priestly ordination is as follows :—“Take thou authority to execute the office of a Priest in the Church of God committed to thee by the imposition of our hands: and be thou a faithful dispenser,” &c. That for Episcopal consecration is the same, *mutatis mutandis*. Now, no one who regards Holy Order as a Sacrament can admit the sufficiency of these forms. In no sense do they constitute a prayer, but they are a mere grant, not of spiritual power, but of external authority. And if it be true, as is asserted, that these wholly unsacramental forms were in former years more commonly used than the alternative, “Receive the Holy Ghost,” it would follow that the American succession cannot possibly be depended on by consistent High Churchmen. Dr. Pusey, in 1867, called attention to the questionable *status* of the American Protestant Church, but no one heeded his words. He has repeated his warning since, but with the same result. Now, however, that “American Orders” have come to England in the shape of the “Reformed Episcopal Church,” High

the Anglican form appears, then, to depend on the first clause only, and on the sense and intention with which those words are used. Already we have seen good reasons for doubting whether they were really used in that sense in which they would suffice ; and before we have concluded our consideration of the theological evidence, we shall have had convincing testimony to their non-sacramental value in the Anglican Ordinal. But we pass by for the present the defence of Anglican Orders which is based on their use, and proceed to notice another which occupies somewhat different ground.

In the early part of the eighteenth century Renaudot, whose eminence as a liturgiologist is undisputed, denied incidentally the validity of Anglican Orders. His *Mémoire* was replied to in a learned and elaborate *Dissertation*, followed by a *Defense*, the work of a Canon Regular of St. Geneviève, Father Pierre Le Courayer. His writings on the subject have been, and are still, very highly valued by Anglicans, who are never weary of praising his "learning and candour," which would have passed for very little had he written on the other side. It is, however, the fact that he was a priest, and wrote ostensibly as a Catholic, that has caused his testimony to be made so much of ; for his theological defence is wholly inadequate,

Churchmen may be disposed seriously to question them ; though hitherto the Ritualists have taken quite a different line, inasmuch as various American Bishops have actively favoured their movement ; and, indeed, some of the most prominent Ritualists of to-day are American "priests." Nor should we omit to notice the significance of the fact of the alternative form being allowed at all. The defenders of the Anglican Apostolical Succession have made a good deal of the efforts, in the end successful, of Seabury, (who was himself a High Churchman), to obtain consecration from the Anglican Episcopate. But it is clear that neither he nor his brother Bishops had any belief in sacramental Orders ; for in their view the form "Take thou authority" was as effective as the other, "Receive the Holy Ghost." Hence it would follow that they did not profess to use the latter in its Catholic and sacramental sense ; and herein they were at one with perhaps every Anglican Bishop consecrated before 1840.

and, indeed, is but rarely maintained by the upholders of the Anglican claim. He throws overboard the form "Receive the Holy Ghost," as not having antiquity in its favour ; but he maintains the validity of the Anglican rite on the ground that it provides imposition of hands with "prayer in general," his reference being to the prayers, properly so called, which the service in various places contains. Certainly Courayer's argument has this merit, that it calls attention to a fact which Anglican writers seem commonly to overlook, that ordination is not a momentary act, beginning and ending with the physical touch of the Bishop's hands, but is elaborate and extended, every part of the function from first to last being at least indirectly connected with it. For even the "laying on of hands with prayer," both in the Catholic and Oriental rites, is of considerably longer duration than the actual imposition of the Bishop's hand. It continues throughout the whole prayer called *Consecratio*, during which the administrator faces the candidates, and extends his hands over them all. The argument, then, is correct enough as applied to a Catholic ordination, but it is not easy to see how it can be brought to bear on the Anglican rite ; for, beyond the form used at the actual imposition of hands, it contains no prayer applied to the ordinands by any external sign ; and it will hardly be maintained that the mere recitation of collects by the Bishop, without any action indicating that his intention is directed towards the candidates, can suffice to convey a gift, which is distinctly sacramental, if it is anything at all. In this matter, though not in this matter alone, the Protestant character of the Anglican Ordinal appears ; for all Protestant ordination rites are similarly deficient in this matter ; whereas in East or West, wherever the Sacrament of Holy Order is truly conferred, the prayer, properly so called, which pre-

cedes, accompanies or follows the imposition of hands, is visibly applied to the ordinands, and so becomes an integral part of the form. No doubt, a prayer that occurs in the ordination rite, without being thus unmistakeably united with the matter of the Sacrament, may be taken to illustrate the sense of the form ; but it cannot be regarded as part of it, unless the one be evidently intended to affect the other. Busembaum thus states the principle on which this is based :—*Ut Sacramentum sit validum, debet inter materiam et formam. . . . tanta esse conjunctio ut secundum moralem hominum æstimationem, spectatâ naturâ cujus-cunque Sacramenti, una alteram afficiat ; hoc est ut verba censeantur cadere in talem rem, et cum eâ unum totale signum constituere.** In the Anglican rite nothing but the words “Receive the Holy Ghost,” down to “in this Congregation where thou shalt be so appointed,” are thus united with the imposition of hands ; and so they alone can be accounted the form of the Sacrament, if such be the character of the ceremony at all. And, indeed, even if the prayers which the service does contain had been visibly applied to the act of ordination, it is not easy to see how Courayer could make them contribute anything to the validity of the rite ; for they contain no reference to sacerdotal functions ; nor is there anything in the rest of the Prayer-book that can be depended upon to give them such illustration ; and here silence, we have seen, means denial. Everything that had implied a consecration of the ordinands, or their receiving spiritual power, had been expunged. Thus, from time immemorial, the Litanies had been sung or said at ordinations ; and towards the close the Bishop rising, and turning to the candidates, who were prostrate on the pavement, signed

* “Medulla,” Lib. VI. Tract. I. cap. 1, dub. ii.

them thrice with the sign of the cross, intoning the petitions, "That thou wouldest deign to bless, to bless and sanctify, to bless, sanctify, and consecrate, these elect." But in the Anglican Ordinal this solemn ceremony shrank into the mere recitation of the words, "That it may please thee to bless these men, and send thy grace upon them, that they may duly execute the office now to be committed unto them, to the edifying of thy Church, and to thy honour, praise and glory." No outward act applied the petition to the ordinands; and it will be observed that the words impetrated no more than a mere *grace d'état*, and not any sacramental consecration. The other prayers in the service, which were all new and Protestant compositions, are even more jejune than this sentence in the Litany, and give no support whatever to the sacerdotal estimate of Anglican Orders.* The singing of the *Veni Creator* was the most Catholic feature in the rite; but this, of course, could not secure a true ordination. The Holy Spirit may be invoked with a variety of aims and intentions; and the use of this hymn has never been confined to the administration of Sacraments. Unless, therefore, the rite itself indicated, as it did not, that a sacramental gift of the Holy Ghost was being sought, to give the ordinands sacerdotal character, the retention of this hymn in the Anglican Ordinal could add nothing to its validity.

We submit, then, that Courayer's theological defence of the Anglican Ordinal is really untenable. Indeed, no Anglican writer (except, perhaps, Mr. Bailey) now attempts

* All the petitions contained in the service will be found above, page 152; save this which occurs at the end of the Litany:—"Mercifully behold these thy servants now called to the office of Priesthood, and replenish them so with the truth of thy doctrine and innocency of life, that both by word and good example they may faithfully serve thee in this office, to the glory of thy name and profit of the Congregation."

to maintain it, though many claim him as a most important witness to the sufficiency of their rites, apparently not perceiving that he cannot be reasonably thus adduced, unless the tenability of his line of argument be accepted as the measure of the value of his testimony; and perhaps also not realising the irrelevance of that line of argument to the position which they themselves adopt. To the last degree precarious in itself, his defence of Anglican ordinations cannot fairly be made even auxiliary to their cause by those who maintain Anglican Orders in the usual way, on the ground of the sufficiency of the form "Receive the Holy Ghost."

Courayer's downward course had begun with a defence of Jansenism. Soon after his protest against the Bull *Unigenitus* he was found as a maintainer of extreme Gallican opinions; and it would seem to have been with the view of irritating the loyal Catholics who opposed him, that he took up the defence of Anglican Orders.* His works on this subject were condemned by the Archbishop of Paris in 1727, and by Benedict XIII. in 1728; not, however, on account of their subject-matter itself, but because they contained heretical doctrine "contrary to what the Church teaches as to the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, the Priesthood, the form of the Sacraments," &c., and as being "subversive of Sacred Orders and other Sacraments of the Church." It would appear, then, that those who claim to be orthodox on these points are really precluded from availing themselves of Courayer's defence of Anglican

* The extreme Gallicans of his day pointed to the Anglican Church as exemplifying the advantages that the Church of France might gain by separation from Rome. This view, however, could only be maintained on the assumption that the Church of England occupied no worse a position than that of a schismatical national Church. Hence, at that period a defence of Anglican Orders by a Catholic priest could not fail to appear tantamount to an open profession of disloyalty towards the Holy See.

Orders, since it was grounded on what they would themselves condemn as heresy, and, indeed, could not otherwise have been maintained. After his condemnation he retired to England, where he was received with the utmost distinction (the University of Oxford had already made him a D.D., *honoris causâ*), and partly conformed to the Anglican Church, which, from its wealth and tolerance of error, is the natural harbour for apostates from Catholicism. He died a Socinian in 1776, and was buried in the cloisters of Westminster Abbey.

§ 35. *Conclusion on the Anglican Rite for the Ordination of a Priest.*

The question of the validity of the Anglican rite for conferring the Priesthood has been discussed at considerable, perhaps at wearisome length, for it is here that we are brought face to face with the main issue of the controversy. The justice of the Ritualists' assertion that an Anglican priest is qualified by his ordination to say Mass and sacramentally to absolve, depends on the character of the Anglican Priesthood. And the sum of the evidence that has been adduced will surely be admitted to justify our counter-assertion that the Anglicanism of the sixteenth century did not contemplate the retention of the Priesthood in the Catholic sense of the term, and that the work of the Reformers was such as to render the modern theory, that they actually, though unintentionally, did retain it, a position to the last degree precarious, and therefore unfitted to be insisted upon in practice. An attempt was made, for political reasons, to retain the nominal ranks of priest in the sense of elder, and of Bishop (as will immediately appear) in the sense of overseer, while the substance of the Priesthood, the *Sacerdotium*, was discarded; and, unless we are prepared to allow that the names could not possibly be retained, without bringing with them the things in their train, it would seem to follow that, in relation to the Catholic Priesthood, Anglican Bishops and priests must be regarded simply as "laymen."

Looking back over the arguments for and against the reality of the Anglican Priesthood, which the preceding pages have discussed, we can distinguish four lines of defence that might be adopted in behalf of the Anglican

rite for priestly ordination, three of which we have considered, while the fourth we have set aside, as being excluded by the principles which we assumed at starting. This last defends the Anglican form on the ground of its peculiarly "Scriptural" character; and it does not really attempt to place the Anglican Priesthood on the same platform as the Catholic. It is maintained by "moderate men," who, though they talk of "Church principles," and of themselves as being members of "the Church," while they repudiate the name of "Protestant," and the validity of foreign Protestant ordinations,—are nevertheless very far from acknowledging that Anglican clergymen are sacrificing priests; and, until they assert this, they have not assumed that position which this Essay challenges. But it is not a little singular that the "Church Quarterly," which is commonly regarded as the organ of the advanced school, should be content merely to maintain and vindicate the professedly Scriptural character of the Anglican Ordinal.* This peculiarity is there appealed to as evidence of the sufficiency of the Anglican form; though, on Catholic principles, it is rather a witness to the heretical doctrine of the Reformers on the nature of Holy Order. To invoke the language of Scripture, privately interpreted, against the teaching of the living Church, has from the first been a characteristic of heresy. And to do this with the view of compiling a new ordination rite, must in any case be a task involving peculiar difficulties, since Scripture without tradition is far from clear as to the nature of the Christian Ministry, and as to the mode in which it is to be transmitted. Moreover, in regard to the special selection of texts which the Anglican Reformers made, it is to be noted that, in consequence of the detestation in which they

* The reference is to the article on "The Anglican Form of Ordination," which appeared in January, 1878.

held the Mass, they took nothing from the account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist (on which occasion all Protestants will surely allow that a special power was conferred upon the Apostles, even though they may not accept the Catholic doctrine, that then and there they were ordained priests),—but they confined themselves to the words recorded by St. John ; although no one had ever taught that by their use alone the Apostles were invested with sacerdotal character. And even here they did not retain the “form,” which the “Scriptural” argument assumes to have been then divinely instituted, in conjunction with the “matter” which was as certainly divinely instituted at the same time ; but, for our Lord’s act of breathing upon the Apostles they substituted the imposition of hands, which, so far as we can tell from the letter of Scripture, has no evangelical authority for its employment at ordination, but was a “development,” though an early one, introduced by the Church. We contend, then, that the “Scriptural” defence of the Anglican form of ordination cannot be maintained, and should not even be attempted, by those who profess to accept Catholic principles, and describe themselves as “Catholic priests.”

The other three lines of defence, to which we have referred, may be described as that adopted by Courayer, that which makes the peculiar Abyssinian case its precedent, and that which regards the Anglican form as a modification of the Western, respectively.

Courayer’s championship of the “prayer in general” used at an Anglican ordination, has been discussed in the last section above. No one can read his “Dissertation” without acknowledging that he had amassed an amount of information on the historical side of the controversy altogether remarkable in a foreign priest. But, at least in his theological defence, he wrote distinctly as a partisan. For

example, after putting together, not quite accurately, the feeble prayers which the Anglican rites contain, he scornfully asks, "What is there more in the Roman Pontifical to determine this form of words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*."* No fair-minded man could give the answer his question implies. And he talks like a Protestant of "our best divines" agreeing with Jacobite High Churchmen in regarding the Holy Eucharist as no more than a commemorative sacrifice; and supports his theory by garbled extracts from a few theologians, while he ignores the precise language of Trent, to which he himself was bound, and with which the Anglicans he quotes certainly did not agree. And throughout his argument he makes no account of the obvious distinction between the simplicity of a rite which has come down from ancient times in an undeveloped form, and the meagreness of another which heresy has framed.

Although the defence of the Anglican Ordinal which takes the Abyssinian case as its precedent occupies different ground from Courayer's, it is really overthrown by the same arguments. For the sense and efficacy of the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* depend on the public intention with which the ceremony as a whole is performed; and this is ascertained by an examination of the language and meaning of the prayers that are said. A clear distinction between Abyssinian and Anglican ordination is found to exist when this examination is made; and hence is deduced the sufficiency of the form in the one case, and its insufficiency in the other.

But, when the origin of the Anglican form of ordination is taken into account, it is evident that the true mode of defending it is to maintain that it is a legitimate modification of the Western rite; or that, in other words, the Anglican

* Courayer "On English Ordinations," p. 112. Oxford, 1844.

Church in the sixteenth century did not substantially change the mode of ordination ; but, without exceeding the liberty in regulating the administration of Sacraments which a local Church may claim, omitted certain supplementary ceremonial details, retaining the essence of the act. And this defence, as we contend, entirely breaks down.

Imposition of hands united with prayer, which witnessed directly or indirectly to the doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice, had been throughout the whole Church from the very first used to ordain a Catholic priest. In process of time this primary matter and form had been supplemented and confirmed by various significant rites, which further defined the intention with which the imposition of hands was performed. At the time of the Reformation, one at least of these had come to be regarded as the essential feature in the ordination ; and, though that opinion is no longer insisted upon, all theologians hold that it could not be *omitted* after it had come into use without endangering the validity of the whole act. But, in the face of immemorial and universal tradition as to the peril of tampering with any of the Church's significant rites, and without any consultation with the Holy See, or with other branches of the Catholic Church, the Anglican Reformers made a clean sweep of the ancient Pontifical, and produced a new compilation, which directed the laying on of hands with no prayer properly so called, but with an imperative form, a text of Scripture, that had been added in the West about five hundred years before, with the view of illustrating and confirming in detail one of the powers that belong to the Priesthood, the Order itself having been already conferred. Nor do they appear to have retained even those words in the Catholic sense ; for that they deemed superstitious. And they made no pretence to retain anything else. The prayer that had

accompanied the principal imposition of hands in the old rite was removed, because it had reference to sacerdotal functions. The supplementary ceremonies were entirely swept away; so that the effect of the whole was to transfer to the now empty place of the first imposition of hands the one Catholic fragment that actually was retained; while to this was appended some words of exhortation, the novel ceremony of the gift of a Bible, together with a formal commission to preach and administer Sacraments.

When, then, the nature of the Anglican Priesthood has to be ascertained, we have to ask this question: "Can we maintain that at the heretical will of a few apostate Bishops at the time of the Reformation, a portion of the Catholic rite, certainly not used *ubique, semper, et ab omnibus*, could be endowed with such power as to suffice to confer the *Sacerdotium*, when neither administrators nor receivers had the intention to give or to take such a thing, and when the fragment itself had never been thought sufficient for such a purpose? Can we suppose that Cranmer or Parker, by the use of words, which, in their plain signification, were designed to invest men with the power of absolution, although the users of them in the case before us meant to do no such thing, at the same time involuntarily conferred upon their Protestant candidates the whole sacerdotal character, and in particular the power to offer the Holy Sacrifice, which they had even less intention to give?" If these questions are answered in the negative (as surely they cannot fail to be), our controversy is ended; for the possession by the Anglican Church of a Priesthood not the same as that of the Catholic Church is not here called in question; it having sufficed to assert that neither Catholics nor Orientals, nor, for that matter, those advanced High Churchmen whom this Essay concerns, recognise anything substantial in such a Ministry.

§ 36. *The Anglican Rite for Episcopal Consecration.*

If the arguments contained in the preceding fifteen sections suffice to prove, so far as the case is one that admits of proof, that the original Anglican form of ordination did not really confer the Priesthood in the Catholic sense of the term, there is no need to discuss the validity of the Anglican rite for Episcopal consecration; for no one who accepts the Catholic view of the Episcopal office will venture to maintain that it would by itself serve to make Bishops out of mere laymen, or even out of duly-ordained deacons. For it must not be forgotten that the office of a Bishop is distinctly a sacerdotal one; the Episcopate is the plenitude of the Priesthood; and without priestly character a Bishop would be such only in name. The relation of the Episcopate to the Presbyterate is like that of Confirmation to Baptism; and an unbaptised person is incapable of being confirmed. In accordance with a tradition of some fifteen centuries' duration in the West, a layman or a deacon elected to be Bishop is first ordained a priest before his consecration can be performed;* and while an ordination *per saltum* to the Presbyterate is regarded as valid but irregular, a consecration *per saltum* to the Episcopate is condemned as null. And, if this be true when the rite contained in the Roman Pontifical is used, which distinctly refers to the sacerdotal functions of a Bishop, his offering of Sacrifice, and his retaining or remitting sins, *à fortiori* is it true of the use of the Anglican rite, which, as we shall see, does not even pro-

* The Roman Breviary relates of St. Ambrose, who was elected Bishop of Milan while only a catechumen, that he received all the Orders:—*Servatis omnibus ex instituto Ecclesiæ ordinum gradibus, episcopale onus suscepit.*

fess to confer a priestly office. It is important that this should be noted ; for some Anglican writers appear to have a vague impression that, whatever may be said of the Anglican Priesthood in the sixteenth century, anyhow the Episcopate was preserved ; and that therefore, when the Ordinal was amended in 1661, there were men qualified to ordain priests, and that since then they actually have done so.

It is true that in the earliest times there were cases in which a man was consecrated Bishop without passing through the inferior grades ; but it must be remembered that similarly in the primitive age, Baptism and Confirmation were not unfrequently administered in one rite ; and that in days when the Church's liturgical action was less strictly regulated than it afterwards became, there would have been no grounds for questioning the validity of a consecration which was distinctly intended to impart the *Summum Sacerdotium* by the use of a single rite.* Indeed, it may well be supposed that even in the present day, a Papal dispensation having been obtained, a layman might be validly consecrated to the Episcopate *per saltum*, by the use of the rite in the Pontifical.† But this could not be applied to the Anglican rite, for, as we have said, it contains no reference to sacerdotal functions ; though, on the other hand, singularly enough, it seems to contemplate the possibility of such a case, for it presents to the Archbishop for consecration “ this godly and learned

* Bellarmine had such cases in view when he wrote :—“*Impossibile est ordinari Episcopum qui antea non sit Presbyter, vel certè non tunc simul accipiat utramque ordinationem, quia utraque est de essentiâ Episcopatûs.*”—“*De Ordine,*” cap. 5.

† There is evidence that in early times such a dispensation was thought necessary, anyhow *post factum*. Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople in 787, who had been elevated to the Episcopate *per saltum*, obtained such a dispensation from Pope Adrian I.

man ; " whereas the Pontifical says, " Most reverend Father, our holy Mother the Church prays you to elevate to the Episcopal office this *Priest* here present."

Whether any of those Anglican Bishops on whose Episcopal character the succession depends, was elevated to the Episcopate without having been first elevated to the Anglican Priesthood, the writer has at hand no means of ascertaining ; but it is clear that, Catholic principles being assumed, if one such case were proved, the validity of the existing Anglican Orders could not be maintained. It is, however, at least not improbable that out of the first batch of Elizabethan Bishops (more than five-and-twenty in all), some may never have been either Catholic or Anglican priests. Indeed, one of them, Young, of St. David's, is described by Camden as having been " an exquisite common lawyer and civilian."* Nor is it certain that, in spite of the recent spread of High Church opinions, previous ordination to the Diaconate and Presbyterate would be insisted upon in the present day, should the Crown select some eminent lay Churchman, or some distinguished Presbyterian minister, to " sit in St. Augustine's chair " at Canterbury. The Prayer-book itself would demand no such preliminaries ; and, though extreme men would not admit the validity of the consecration, the great bulk of the moderate High Church party would probably not be indisposed to turn " antiquity " to account for a favourable judgment upon it.

We maintain, however, that, on Catholic principles, unless the original Anglican ordination rites produced real priests, they cannot have produced real Bishops, after the

* The Bishops whom James I. had " consecrated " for Scotland in 1610 were not ordained priests ; for Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, believed in the validity of Presbyterian Orders. Those, however, whom Charles II. sent in 1661 were first made deacons and priests ; a fact that witnesses to the influence of the seventeenth century High Church revival.

elder clergy had died out, for they had not, so to speak, the material on which to work. And under these circumstances we might be content to take no notice of the Episcopal rite, leaving the controversy to be decided on the question of the Anglican Priesthood. Nevertheless, not to omit all reference to a subject, which, in view of the consecration of Parker is not devoid of interest, and has, moreover, been elaborately vindicated by more than one writer on the Anglican side, we proceed briefly to compare the Catholic and Anglican rites for Episcopal consecration.

First of all it may be worth noting that, whereas the Pontifical had spoken of the "Consecration of a Bishop-elect," the Reformed rite speaks of the "Form of Consecrating an Archbishop or Bishop." The omission of the word "elect" may perhaps be allowed to have some significance, when it is remembered that at the time of the compilation of the rite ideas were prevalent which made the Royal appointment to be the act of paramount importance by which the Episcopal dignity was conferred; the subsequent consecration being regarded as a mere ceremony, similar to enthronization and the like, appropriate indeed, and up to a certain point necessary, but not the substantial act itself, as a modern High Churchman would hold. The omission, however, though conspicuous in the title page, cannot be insisted upon as important, for it is supplied by the rubrics which follow.

And then, again, the expression "Consecration of an Archbishop," betrays some confusion as to the idea of Episcopal consecration. No one can be consecrated an *Archbishop*. A priest selected for that dignity is consecrated a Bishop; and a simple Bishop he remains until he has received the Pall, which has for centuries, and certainly ever since the days of St. Augustine of Canterbury, been the instrument by which the Metropolitan dignity is conferred.

In the Catholic Pontifical, after the preliminary oath of allegiance to the Pope, and the enquiry into the good will and sound faith of the Elect, the Consecrator thus defines Episcopal functions :—*Episcopum oportet judicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare, et confirmare.* The consecration itself begins with the book of the Gospels being placed upon the neck and shoulders of the Elect ; and then the Consecrator, and the two Bishops assisting, lay both their hands on his head, and all say, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum.* The use of these words at this time is not primitive ; indeed, they are a far later addition than the “tradition of the instruments” to the matter of priestly ordination. They appear to have been inserted in the Roman Pontifical from other Western rites about the year 1400. Anciently the imposition of hands was in silence, as at the ordination of a priest, and was immediately followed, as in the existing rite, by the prayer called *Consecratio*, which is continued at some length in the form of a Preface. Certain expressions which occur in it make clear the character of the sacramental grace which is being conferred. Thus, the Consecrator prays, *inclinato super hunc famulum tuum cornu gratiæ sacerdotalis benedictionis tuæ in eum effunde virtutem.* Later the Elect is described as, *hic famulus tuus, quem ad summi Sacerdotii ministerium elegisti ;* and the prayer continues, *comple in Sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam.* Next follows the unction of the head (an addition to the primitive rite), after which the prayer is resumed in words of singular beauty. The hands are then anointed, and the Consecrator concludes the form with a benediction, in which occur the words, *Deus . . . qui te ad Pontificatus sublimari voluit dignitatem.*

Now all this long ceremony (it occupies with the music some sixteen pages in the Pontifical) is in reality one

elaborated act, and is the consecration itself. Several minor details follow, such as the giving of the pastoral staff, the ring, the book of the Gospels, and (at the end of the Mass) the mitre and gloves. But these are not in themselves essentials of the rite; and, as has been noted above in the case of the analogous ceremonies in the order for the Presbyterate, merely illustrate and confirm in detail powers and dignities that have been already conferred. Indeed, the civil power has sometimes asserted its right to the investiture with staff and ring; and that without prejudice to the validity of the consecration; though the act implied some encroachment on the Church's jurisdiction, and was consequently resisted.

It is hardly necessary to say that the Anglican formulary, and especially in its sixteenth century edition, presents, both in general tone and in detail, a very decided contrast with the Catholic rite at which we have glanced. No one can study it, remembering how it came into existence, without being persuaded that its framers did not contemplate the retention of Catholic Episcopacy, but a merely nominal counterpart thereof, which should be entrusted with authority to teach and rule, but should receive no special spiritual power.* Primitive Anglican

* As illustrative of the intention to found in the Church of England Evangelical as distinct from Catholic Episcopacy, we may note what was written to one of the foreign Reformers a few days before Parker's consecration by Jewell, whom Parker a week later "consecrated" Protestant Bishop of Salisbury:—"As to your expressing your hopes that our Bishops will be consecrated without any superstitious and offensive ceremonies, you mean, I suppose, without oil, without the chrism, without the tonsure. And you are not mistaken; for the sink would indeed have been emptied to no purpose, if we had suffered those dregs to settle at the bottom. Those oily, shaven, portly hypocrites we have sent back to Rome from whence we first imported them; for we require our Bishops to be pastors, labourers and watchmen."—"Zurich Letters," First Series, p. 50. It may, of course, be objected that Jewell here merely repudiates non-essential details; but it is clear that in his mind the idea of an Anglican Bishop was perfectly distinct from the idea of a

Episcopacy was not regarded as bearing any special relation to the valid administration of the Sacraments. No single Anglican writer, Hooker not excepted, during the reign of Elizabeth so much as suggests that by preserving an Episcopal succession, the Church of England had secured an inheritance of sacramental grace such as the foreign Protestants had forfeited. And, even when the necessity of Episcopal ordination was first insisted on, that necessity was based, not on the grace, but on the authority that should be inherent in such Orders. The idea of government was alone connected with the office of a Bishop in the Elizabethan Church.

The rite before us fully bears out this estimate of Anglican Episcopacy. There is no definition of Episcopal functions, as in the Pontifical, but we can gather with tolerable accuracy from the prayers, exhortations, and public examination what they are supposed to be. "To administer discipline," "to teach," "to preach the Word," and "to feed the flock,"—these are his duties, and these are all. Scriptural language is very effectively employed; but there is nothing whatever to indicate the Catholic view of the Episcopate as the High Priesthood of the Church. The few and meagre prayers which the rite contains have no reference to any spiritual power which the so-called "Consecration" is to impart. Like those in the rite for the ordination of priests, they do no more than impetrate a *grace d' état*. In the course of his public examination, the Elect says that he is persuaded that he is called to this ministration according to the will of Christ "and the order of this Realm." He promises to teach nothing as necessary for salvation unless he is sure

Roman Catholic Bishop, like St. Augustine of Canterbury; and, indeed, it would be unreasonable to make his words mean, "We shall take care only to omit such ceremonies as the Catholics themselves regard as non-essential."

that it can be proved out of Holy Scripture, nothing being said of traditional interpretation. And he undertakes to make a proper use of the authority which he has, "by God's Word," and which is to be committed to him "by the ordinance of this Realm."* Thus he presents himself for admission to the Episcopate as to an ecclesiastical State office, making a profession of faith that is neither more nor less than the ordinary Protestant view, that Scripture interpreted by his private judgment is to be to each man the sole rule of faith; and from the rite by which he is admitted to this Erastian Episcopate, every expression that had taught or implied the sacerdotal dignity of the office has been carefully expurged. Here, then, as before, we are led to conclude that the Church of England retained the name of Bishop simply in its etymological signification of "overseer," just as above we found reason to believe she retained in the sense of "elder" the ancient name of "priest."

With the intention, then (as interpreted by their acts and words), of giving a formal religious confirmation to the office of Chief Superintendent (already substantially conferred by the Queen's appointment), in a thoroughly Erastian community, and being fully persuaded that their power to act as Bishops flowed solely from the Crown (for this they had solemnly to affirm, as all Anglican Bishops have done, and do at this day, when making their homage to the Sovereign), Barlow and the others laid their hands on Parker, and, using the Edwardine rite (if such were really the case), said, "Take the Holy Ghost," adding some words of Scriptural exhortation together with the gift of a Bible. Is it conceivable that such an act (apart from all question of Barlow's Episcopal

* The reference to his being "faithful in ordaining" was added in 1662.

character) sufficed to elevate a priest, as Parker certainly was, to the rank of a Catholic Bishop? The form that they used was even more jejune than that in the rite for the Anglican Priesthood, for it contained, besides no specification of the office, no invocation of the Holy Trinity. Yet modern High Churchmen hold it to be absolutely certain that the act in question did really make Parker a Bishop in the Catholic sense; though it is pretty clear that no one thought so at the time. And certainly no Elizabethan Bishop ever wished to be regarded as *Pontifex*, *Antistes*, or *Summus Sacerdos*; though perhaps in the seventeenth century some Anglican prelates would have been gratified at having such titles applied to them;* as would, no doubt, several in our own day.

We contend then that, except in name and in the exercise of external authority, Catholic and Anglican Bishops have really nothing in common. The Catholic Bishop is primarily a High Priest, and his daily Sacrifice is his most important work. The Anglican Bishop is, indeed, called upon to "administer discipline;" and this expression might have been taken as referring to his regulation of the Sacrament of Penance, did not the actual history of Anglicanism, past and present, forbid such an interpretation. In fact, the authority with which he administers discipline is committed to him "by the ordinance of this Realm;" it comes from the sword of State, and not from the keys of Peter. And some instructive instances of the mode of its exercise, in days when Anglican prelates were not what they have been in later times, courteous, scholarly and tolerant men, but acted the part of mere ecclesiastical sheriffs, may be found, as

* It seems that Archbishop Sancroft actually did get so far as to speak of his *pontificium munus*, and to appoint Lloyd his "Vicar and Nuncio." (!)

against Puritans on the one hand, in the pages of Neal's "History;" and, as against Catholics on the other, in Challoner's "Memoirs of Missionary Priests." The High Church newspapers complain of the "persecution" suffered by their clients at the hands of the present Bishops of the Established Church; but three hundred years ago they would have found it a more serious affair, had the men, who now undergo suspension and deprivation rather than give up some ceremonial details of questionable authority, been found enrolled in the courageous ranks of those, with whom alone (assuming their professions to be deep and sincere), they could have had any real religious sympathy in the latter half of the sixteenth century.

§ 37. *The Anglican Church and the Sacrament of Holy Order.*

The sum of the theological argument against the sufficiency of the Anglican forms whether for the Priesthood or the Episcopate, amounts to this, that in the Church of England ordination is not a Sacrament. It is such with Catholics, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians and Copts, and all these have valid Orders. But Holy Order is not a Protestant Sacrament, and Protestants have consequently lost the Priesthood. With these we contend that Anglicans must be classed, on grounds both historical and theological. For the Church of England has not merely rejected Order from among the "Sacraments of the Gospel," on account of its not having "any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" (an assertion which should not be forgotten by those who maintain the "Scriptural" defence of the Anglican rite), but she has put forth an Ordinal which contains nothing that can safely be accounted a sacramental action. At the utmost Anglican ordination is but a benediction of the formal grant of a commission; and benediction is not a Sacrament.* Where the Sacrament of Holy Order is truly administered, the

* In the Roman Pontifical, in addition to the rite for the Benediction of an Abbot, those for the Investiture of an Archbishop with the Pall, for the Consecration of Virgins, and for the Coronation of a King or Queen, may be referred to as examples of the solemn blessing of a grant of external authority, or as the formal admission to a state of life, accompanied with prayer and benediction. But by none of these ceremonies in any Sacrament conferred, nor any *virtus spiritualis* imparted, nor indelible character imprinted on the soul; but a *grace d' état* is formally impetrated; and the subject of the ceremony may, *ex opere operantis*, obtain an increase of sanctifying grace. Our contention is that the Anglican ordination rites were meant to be and are only of this character, and therefore are not the administration of a true Sacrament.

person ordained is consecrated ; spiritual power is infused into his soul, and an indelible character is imprinted upon it. But the Anglican rites do not profess to do so much as this ; and they cannot be allowed as valid if they actually do less.

The estimate of the ministerial office which is furnished by the twenty-fifth Article is a significant commentary on the nature of the Anglican rites. The Article states that five of the seven Sacraments of the New Law are either "a corrupt following of the Apostles," or else are "states of life allowed in the Scriptures." The plural form used in this latter category necessitates our including under it some other Sacrament besides Holy Matrimony. And Confirmation, as well as Penance and Extreme Unction, would seem to belong to the class condemned as "a corrupt following of the Apostles." We are therefore led to conclude that the Anglican definition of the Priesthood is "a state of life allowed in the Scriptures." So barren a conception of the ministerial office testifies to the unsacramental character of the Anglican ordination rites, and indicates nothing less than a gulf between the Anglican and Catholic Priesthoods ; while it witnesses to a close resemblance in all but name between the Anglican and other Protestant views of the nature of the Christian Ministry.

The thirty-sixth Article testifies no less unmistakeably to the non-sacramental use of the words "Receive the Holy Ghost" in the Anglican rites. Its title shirks the word "priest," and speaks of "Consecration of Bishops and Ministers ;"* and its contention is this, that "The

* The word "consecration" seems to have been very loosely used in Elizabeth's reign, perhaps from mere carelessness, but more likely (as we have seen in the case of other Catholic expressions), with the view of weaning it from its "superstitious" associations. Here it is made to include the ordination of

Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward VI., and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering; *neither hath it anything that is of itself superstitious and ungodly.*" Those who are acquainted with the religious history of the times in which this Article was produced, and have observed the mode in which the Anglicans of the day, including Hooker, replied to the objections raised by the Puritans against the Anglican system, will find no difficulty in here "reading between the lines:"—"You complain that we consecrate Bishops and priests, and that so we appear to have affinity with the old Anti-Christian religion? Be consoled; our Bishops are but superintendents, and our priests elders: altars and sacrifices, as you know, they have none; and after all, what is their consecration, or whatever you like to call it, but admission to a state of life? You complain again that in ordaining them we say, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven,' and that these words seem to countenance one of the worst errors of Popery? But remember that they are the words of Christ himself, and there-

Anglican priests and deacons; but there are several examples of its being used for the "confirmation" of Bishops. An official document, issued by Elizabeth in October, 1559, says, not only of Parker, Grindal and Cox, but also of Barlow and Scory, that they "remain unconsecrated;" and Rymer's version of the Queen's commission by which Barlow obtained the See of Chichester, distinctly directs Parker to "consecrate" him. Various other examples can be adduced of official documents, issued between the date of the rejection of the Pope's Supremacy and the end of the century, wherein *consecrare* appears to be used for *confirmare*; while there are others in which *confirmare* stands for, or includes, *consecrare*. And Sampson, writing to Peter Martyr shortly after Parker's consecration, appears to deprecate the term altogether:—"Your friend Jewell, of Salisbury (and others), will follow shortly; for they are soon, as I hear, to be *consecrated*, as we call it."—"Zurich Letters," First Series, p. 63.

fore cannot be in themselves ungodly or superstitious. He thus addressed his Apostles ; and yet they had no power to forgive sins, such as the Papists claim. True it is that for these centuries they have been superstitiously applied ; but the abuse does not take away the use ; and now, by not shrinking from them, in spite of their apparent harmony with the old errors, we rescue them from Antichrist, and vindicate their primitive and Protestant signification."

There is, in fact, a complete correspondence between the Catholic admission and the Anglican repudiation (for such we submit the Article implies), of a certain sense in which the words, " Bishop," " priest," " consecrate," " Receive the Holy Ghost," " whose sins thou dost forgive," &c., may be used. Clearly the Article admits that the Ordinal does contain expressions calculated to provoke objection as being " superstitious and ungodly ;" and it can refer to nothing else but the expressions just noted. But it protests that the objection cannot be sustained, inasmuch as the expressions in question do not of themselves deserve such a condemnation. What is this but to say, " In the mouths of our Anglican Bishops these words have no longer any superstitious significance, for they are not used in the sense which they bore in the Catholic rites."

When, then, we admit that in a certain sense and under certain circumstances the forms in the Anglican Ordinal would suffice to confer the Priesthood and Episcopate, we mean that they are words capable of being used with a sacramental intention, to the orthodoxy of which other parts of the rites, or at least the office and work of those thus ordained and consecrated, should bear witness. But it is just this sacramental intention which the thirty-sixth Article appears to repudiate ; and the thoroughness of this repudiation the actual functions of Anglican Bishops

and priests during three hundred years have, as near as may be, demonstrated. Catholics, then, have only to add that, although capable of a sacramental use, it by no means follows that from Protestant lips the forms would have this significance and force ; and that, having been deliberately selected as "not in themselves superstitious," to the exclusion of all else that, from the heretical standpoint, could not escape this condemnation, they were evidently shorn of their legitimate sense in the minds of those who compiled, accepted, and first used the Anglican ordination rites ; and that therefore, not merely from lack of sufficient interior intention on the part of the administrators (for this we concede), but from lack of due meaning in the words (to which the public intention with which they were used bore witness), the forms themselves did not suffice to confer the Sacrament of Holy Order.

It may, of course, be objected that we have no right to assert that the words did not bear the Catholic sense, unless we are able to show what was the precise sense that they bore. But to this it is fair to reply that, if we have shown that they cannot possibly have been used as a Catholic Bishop would have used them, we are no longer concerned with their meaning. So great was the diversity in theological opinion among the Reformers themselves at the time that the Anglican system was established, that it may well be doubted whether any one could say what their meaning exactly was. But, if we could ascertain in what sense modern Evangelical clergymen believe that they are priests, and how they agree to interpret the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c., as used by our Lord, and as repeated in their own ordination, we might well conclude that the same interpretation was in the minds of the Elizabethan Bishops when performing their ordinations and consecrations ; for, beyond all question, Low Church-

men are alone among the existing members of the Church of England in having any real sympathy with the Reforming divines. And their view would presumably be that the words are a solemn form of Scriptural benediction, in which the aid of the Holy Spirit is invoked to the end that the new minister may faithfully preach the Gospel of forgiveness, or that the new Bishop may worthily preside over his clergy. Certainly they would deny that the ordaining Bishop employs them as a sacramental formula by their use imparting to the new priest spiritual power to perform supernatural functions, and imprinting on his soul a sacred character. Least of all would they allow that Anglican ordination qualifies men to offer Christ in sacrifice for the living and the dead.

We are not, however, left wholly in the dark as to the meaning originally assigned to the words of the Anglican form. No more unexceptionable witness can be adduced than Whitgift, third Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury. Compared with his predecessors he may almost be styled a High Churchman;* and he seems to have had a vague impression that the Orders of the Church of England were in some way better than those of the foreign Protestants. And to his firmness and energy was undoubtedly due the permanence of the Church of England as an endowed and hierarchical establishment. In Parker's day Anglicanism had been little else than a semi-political semi-religious com-

* Grindal, Whitgift's immediate predecessor was notoriously a thorough Puritan. Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop, has been sometimes claimed as a High Churchman, but without sufficient evidence. Never having left England, he was not personally acquainted with the foreign Reformers, who acted as spiritual directors to Grindal, Cox, Horn and others; nor did he sympathise with the bareness of Puritan worship. Moreover, he fell in with the political scheme for preserving an apparent continuity with the ancient Church of England, and styled himself "seventieth Archbishop." Nevertheless he was a genuine Protestant; and, though he was reticent about his own views, there is no evidence that they differed materially from those of his suffragans, who were Calvinists with only one exception.

promise, to which the nation had indeed to conform, while a mere handful of persons in their hearts accepted it. Grindal, his successor, was a weak man, and his sympathies were all with the Puritans, whose attacks on the peculiarities of Anglicanism he resisted so feebly that the Established Church was within a little of going to pieces; and Elizabeth suspended him for his remissness. But Whitgift was a man of a different stamp. He became Archbishop in 1583, and held the Primacy of the Anglican Church during the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign.* The Anglican succession, of whatever character it be, passed through his hands,—a fact that gives great importance to his estimate of the meaning of the forms he used. And he says plainly, "The Bishop, by speaking these words, doth not take upon him to give the Holy Ghost, no more than he doth to remit sins when he pronounceth the remission of sins." So far his criticism is merely negative, and is in agreement with our own, in

* Whitgift was a great favourite with the Queen. From Walton's "Life of Hooker," prefixed to his works, we learn that she called him her "little black husband," and went to dine with him "very often" at Lambeth, when in her later years she failed to secure the admiration of more mundane courtiers. According to the same authority, "by justifiable sacred insinuations . . . he wrought himself into so great a degree of favour with her, as, by his pious use of it, hath got both of them a great degree of fame in this world, and of glory in that into which they are now both entered." Moreover he "beheld the closing of those eyes that had long looked upon him with reverence and affection; . . . he was the chief mourner at her sad funeral; and within a few hours after her death he was the happy proclaimer of King James." Those were indeed the halcyon days of the Church of England, which realised to the full the union, or rather the unity and identity, of Church and State, when the Archbishop of Canterbury was the link between the two successions, and, after having been privileged to witness "the setting of that bright occidental star," the apostate Elizabeth, was obviously the right person to hail the appearance, "as of the sun in his strength," of Presbyterian James. Whitgift's personal character cannot easily be ascertained. According to Walton, "he was like the ark, which left a blessing upon the place where it rested; and in all his employments was like Jehoiada, that did good unto Israel." But if Fletcher, a Nonconformist writer, is to be believed, "his throne was a chair of pestilence; his mouth full of cursing against God and his saints."

regard to the nature of Anglican absolutions, as well as of Anglican ordinations. He adds, however, a positive explanation of the form, which is to our purpose here: "By speaking these words of Christ, 'Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted,' &c., *he doth shew the principal duty of a minister, and assureth him of the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, if he labour in the same accordingly.*"* Thus interpreted, the words are merely *conacionalia* and *promissoria*, not *consecratoria*; and, therefore not sacramental in intention or effect. And, indeed, in another place the same Archbishop says expressly, "It appeareth not wherever our Saviour did ordain the Ministry of the Gospel to be a Sacrament."†

After the lapse of a hundred years the revisers of the Prayer-book in 1661, stimulated by Presbyterian cavillers, and anxious to secure the dignity of the Episcopate by distinguishing it more clearly from the lower rank, interpolated into the forms the words "for the office and work of a Bishop (or, of a priest), in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands." The insertion of these words destroyed, indeed, the strictly "Scriptural" character of the Anglican ordination rites, but gave them meanwhile a sacramental flavour; for the form "Receive the Holy Ghost" could now less obviously be regarded as merely hortatory or promissory, but appeared to be used as conveying, in conjunction with the imposition of hands, spiritual power for the performance of certain definite ministerial acts. And it may well be allowed that, if these words had been there from the first, and had been illustrated either here or elsewhere in the Prayer-book by some testimony to the offering of sacrifice as being the primary characteristic of the "office and work

* Whitgift's "Works," vol. i. p. 489.

† Ibid., vol. ii. p. 1129.

of a priest in the Church of God," Anglican Orders would have been eminently defensible on theological grounds ; though their certain validity could not have been conceded, on account of the gross sacrilege which would still have been chargeable to the Reformers' proceedings in the sixteenth century.

But the revisers in question, High Churchmen as they were, had not in view a defence of the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood, nor of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. It was as champions of the Episcopal office that they added to the forms of ordination. And, whatever apparent force the interpolations now give, they came, of course, a hundred years too late to serve any substantial purpose. The rotten links of the earlier consecrations and ordinations extended in 1662 through two or three generations of Anglican ministers ; and, even when the seventeenth century began, valid Orders were not to be found in England, save among the brave and holy missionaries, sent out from France or Rome, to suffer cruel and persistent persecution, if not death ; some of whom in the very presence of their judges did not fear to bear witness to the nullity of the Anglican Priesthood.*

* See in the Appendix, Note XII., on "The Testimony of the English Martyrs."

§ 38. *The Question of the Consecration of William Barlow.*

Enough has now been said to call attention to the cogency of the theological evidence against the validity of Anglican Orders. We submit that it is morally conclusive against the assertion that Anglicanism has produced Bishops and priests in the Catholic sense of the terms.

Under these circumstances we might be willing to concede the historical evidence, as being mainly of "antiquarian interest," and as in any case insufficient either to add to or detract from the strength of an argument already so strong. It may, of course, be urged that modern researches have pretty nearly established the fact of Parker's consecration; and it may further be contended that, for aught we know, documents are lying in the dust in some public or private library, which will one day be found, and will do the same service for Barlow. But, even should this be accomplished (and its unlikelihood will be admitted by those who know that the investigations of the last five-and-twenty years have rendered Barlow's case far more questionable than it was before), the Catholic argument against the reality of the Anglican Priesthood would remain unrefuted; for it is less the facts of the Anglican succession than the character of the acts by which that succession is alleged to have been continued, that Catholics seriously call in question.

Nevertheless, it is undeniable that not a few writers have challenged the Anglican Episcopal succession on historical grounds; and especially in earlier days they have denied the fact of Parker's consecration. That they were mistaken on this point is now almost universally admitted; but that they were not unreasonable, and cer-

tainly not dishonest, in regarding with suspicion such evidence of that event as was set before them, we think we shall be able to show, if certain circumstances are fairly taken into consideration. And it is obvious that, so long as Catholics had grounds for believing that there was an actual breach in the historical succession, it was a "short and easy method" of dealing with Anglican Episcopal pretensions to point to that breach, rather than to waste time over theological arguments with men to whom the principles of Catholic theology were in no sense a rule. But in the present day the position of things is changed ; and at least with the extreme Ritualists Catholics ought to be able to conduct a theological argument on common ground. Hence follows the comparative unimportance of the historical evidence, which, however, we do not wish to ignore ; and so we will briefly state the two cases which are called in question.

William Barlow is the link that connects the Anglican Hierarchy with the ancient Church, for he was Parker's Consecrator.* Was he ever a Bishop himself? This is a question to which no certain answer can be given. No record of his consecration exists ; but this by itself would be a matter of little moment, since the Registers of the period are by no means complete. According to Mr. Bailey,† the half-page following the record of his "confirmation" has been left blank, presumably with a view to the registration of the consecration ; and the same writer is

* The effect of the coöperation of Hodgkins and others is discussed in the next section below.

† "Defence of Holy Orders in the Church of England," p. 45. "We admit that in Cranmer's Register the consecration of Barlow is not to be found, but his confirmation only (although the half page following the confirmation being left vacant, affords a reasonable supposition that it was omitted by the fault of the Registrar, whose duty it was to enter it), but neither are those of many other Bishops, whose consecration has never as yet been doubted by any one."

of opinion that the omission must be set down to the carelessness of the Registrar ; but one may quite as plausibly suppose that the official was conscientiously waiting to insert a record of the consecration when it had taken place, and that the occasion for his doing so never arose. And certainly, though the absence of any record of consecration would carry little weight when no possible reason could be adduced for doubting the fact, its significance becomes grave when there are circumstances to arouse suspicion. That there are such circumstances in Barlow's case is what we must now proceed to indicate ; having first of all, however, fully admitted that it is difficult to understand how he could so long and so successfully have acted an assumed part without any consecration, especially as he had disputes with his Chapter at St. David's, and passed for a Bishop for thirty-two years.

Barlow had been Prior of the Augustinians at Bisham, near Maidenhead, and had warmly espoused the cause of the King's marriage with Anne Boleyn. In reward for his services he was by the King's direction elected Bishop of St. Asaph, early in 1536 (two years after the rejection of the Pope's Supremacy); but, before he obtained possession of the See, he was in April, the same year, preferred to the more lucrative position of Bishop of St. David's. One Anglican writer (Godwin) has endeavoured to maintain that he was consecrated on February 22nd, before the translation ; but since he is repeatedly described as merely "elect" in the documents referring to that event, it is clear that such was not the case ; and, indeed, this view has long ceased to have any supporters. During the spring he had been busy in Scotland on a mission which had already taken him there twice before, viz., an attempt to induce King James to follow the example of King Henry in rejecting the Pope's Supremacy.

He was, however, in London on April 21st, and was on that day "confirmed" in person as Bishop of St. David's, and obtained Archbishop Cranmer's certificate of that event. On the 26th he was granted the temporalities of the See by means of a peculiar document, which included the "restitution" of those which had accrued since the death of the last Bishop. The grant of these latter ordinarily implies that consecration has taken place; and hence certain writers, whom Dr. Lee follows, assert that he must have been consecrated on Sunday, April 25th; but this is, of course, a mere conjecture. There is, however, no doubt that on and after April 26th he called himself and was called "Bishop of St. David's;" that he hastened at once to his distant See, and was enthroned there on May 1st; that he received on April 27th his summons to the House of Lords as Bishop; and that he took his seat there unchallenged on June 30th; nor, so far as is known, was his Episcopal *status* ever publicly called in question until 1614, seventy-eight years after these events.

All this seems strongly in his favour; but there are facts on the other side. The grant of temporalities usually recites the fact of consecration. Barlow's does not, though it does speak of his nomination by the King, his election by the Chapter, and his confirmation by Cranmer. Indeed, it differs significantly from all similar documents. It is not the usual "restitution of the temporalities," by which the emoluments of the See (which, according to custom, lapse to the Crown during a vacancy), are restored to the new Bishop after his consecration, but "a grant of the custody of the temporalities *on account of the vacancy of the See.*" These peculiar grants were sometimes made to a Bishop-elect before consecration; and after that event they practically merged

into the "restitution," which was then granted. Other such documents are expressly in force up to the date of the restitution ; but this one has an exceptional clause attached to it, for the grant is to Barlow and to his assigns "during his life." Thus, the grant of restitution after consecration is rendered unnecessary. And in other respects the language employed is peculiar. After reciting the fact of Barlow's nomination, election, and confirmation, but without any reference to consecration, it continues thus :—"Now we (King Henry) *for certain causes and considerations us specially moving, and for the sincere affection which we have and bear for the said* (William Barlow), now grant *to the same now Bishop* all and singular the issues, lands," &c., &c. The wording of the document, though it describes Barlow as "now Bishop," would certainly lead us to conclude that he was not consecrated at the date of its execution, and that it was drawn up in this exceptional way to secure him the enjoyment of the temporalities of his See without the need of any further formality.* And this view is confirmed by the fact that, when Barlow took his seat in the House of Lords on June 30th, the Bishop of Norwich, who had been consecrated on June 11th, took precedence before him. For these reasons Mr. Haddan felt himself constrained to give up the earlier dates ; and he suggested that Barlow was also consecrated on June 11th, though there is no evidence to support this view. Moreover, since his book was published, Canon Estcourt has called attention to an official document, a warrant to the Garter

* Another peculiarity in regard to this document is that it was looked upon as secular and not as ecclesiastical, and was therefore deposited in the office of the Exchequer instead of among the Patent Rolls in Chancery, as was customary with the ordinary grants of temporalities. These important facts have recently been brought to light through the researches of Canon Estcourt, who has treated Barlow's case with great care.—"Anglican Ordinations," pp. 60-81.

King-at-arms from Thomas Cromwell, who was intimate with Barlow, and must have known well enough whether he was consecrated or not ; and in this letter, which is dated June 12th, Barlow is still described as "elect of St. David's." Now, no one supposes that he was consecrated after he had taken his seat in Parliament at the end of this month ; and it has been pointed out by Canon Estcourt that, by being content to take the lowest place on his entry into the House, he gave no occasion for the fact of his consecration being questioned ; so that, if he really obtained the position of a spiritual peer without having actually received Episcopal character, we may conclude that he was never a true Bishop at all. And since, as will immediately appear, he had himself the utmost contempt for the ceremony of consecration, we may rest assured that, so soon as he found himself in possession of all the substantial advantages of the Episcopal office, he would be at no pains to obtain what had in his eyes no value whatever.*

Mr. Bailey indeed urges, and with considerable force, that what we now know of Barlow's disputes with his Chapter must be accepted as weighty testimony in favour of the consecration ; since its omission would have placed a ready weapon in their hands, which they certainly never used. He adduces as "the strongest proof yet given that Bishop Barlow must have been consecrated," a letter to Thomas Cromwell from John Barlow, the Bishop's brother, asking him to assist him in his struggle with his Canons. It appears that they had expressed their determination "to spend to their shirts in the quarrel," rather than yield to

* Professor Stubbs, in his "*Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*," makes no attempt to fix a date for Barlow's consecration, but merely refers to "Haddan on Bramhall." And Mr. Haddan's date (June 11th) must be given up since the discovery of Cromwell's letter referred to above. If a day can be named at all it must be after the 12th and before the 30th of June, 1536.

his exorbitant demands ; while the Bishop, according to his brother's account, was resolved, " with the help of God and your Lordship," to dwell among them till he had gained his cause. The pertinence of the letter lies chiefly in the sentence, " nothing have they to say against him, but that never Bishop claimed any such things before." This, however, only shows that, either Barlow had been duly consecrated, or, if not, that his Canons were in ignorance of the omission. Reasons will be given below for our preference of this latter alternative ; and here it will suffice to point out that the expression in John Barlow's letter may fairly be taken as a private intimation that the fact of the omission, of which both Cromwell and his correspondent would have been well aware, had not become known to the Canons, so that the Bishop's cause was not in danger on that account.

That we have done Barlow no injustice in asserting that he had himself no belief in the necessity of consecration, is evident from the fact that in a sermon preached at St. David's, in the very year of his supposed consecration, he said that " if the King's Highness, being Supreme Head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate and elect any layman, being learned, to be a Bishop, that he so chosen, *without mention made of any Orders*, should be as good a Bishop as he (Barlow) was, or the best in England." Perhaps a more grossly Erastian sentiment has never been uttered ; but, so far as his own Episcopal character is concerned, the words are ambiguous, and cannot safely be taken as evidence either for or against his consecration. If he really was no Bishop, we must suppose that in thus speaking his aim was to indoctrinate his flock with his own heretical notions on the nature of the Episcopal office, at the same time being careful to say nothing that might lead his hearers to suppose that in his

own case consecration had been omitted. They would, of course, have taken for granted that the ceremony had been performed in London before he came to be enthroned in his See ; while his chaplains, and the few, if any others, at St. David's, who were in the secret, and so were practically his accomplices, would only have smiled at the shrewdness of his Lordship's *double entendre*. To them, in fact, it would sound like a justification and *rationale* of his acting as Bishop without consecration. But, if he was really a Bishop at the time, his words naturally imply no more than his own utter contempt for the sacred Order he had just received.

We have now called attention to certain facts which must be admitted to have an ugly look, when taken in connection with the blank space in the Register. Against them, however, Anglicans may reasonably urge, "What motive could Barlow have had for shirking consecration? Whatever may have been his opinion as to the value of the ceremony, was it not worth his while to submit to it, so as to establish his position beyond all possible cavil? And could so portentous an omission have possibly escaped the notice of those who would certainly have used it against him had they been aware of the fact?"

That there was no motive for the omission is by no means clear. Barlow was before all things the obsequious tool of the King ; and there are papers extant in the King's handwriting, in which he argues that the ordering of Bishops, as well as their appointment, belongs of right to him—*i.e.*, that it was practically included in his Royal acts of nomination and election. Cranmer, the Archbishop, by whom in the ordinary course of things Barlow would have been consecrated, shared these views ;* and

* Four years after Barlow's supposed consecration, Cranmer, in his "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man," made public his opinion as to

so here was an opportunity for the Bishop-elect to give the King a flattering testimonial to the accuracy of his theology. And it is difficult to put any other interpretation on the language of the grant of temporalities, quoted above, save this, that the King on his part was supporting Barlow in some such omission. This, of course, would at once dispose of the objection that such an irregularity would render both Cranmer and Barlow liable to the penalties of *præmunire*. The Archbishop would have incurred these by a *refusal* to consecrate; but that is a very different thing from his omitting it to please the King. And the possession of the temporalities (which, together with his summons to Parliament, Barlow had obtained, as must now be allowed, before consecration), legalised all his acts in connection with the diocesan property; so that, if only his want of Episcopal character could be concealed from his enemies, who were chiefly those who adhered to the ancient faith, he had no reason to fear the loss of anything he cared to retain.

Many circumstances would combine to favour such concealment. Party-spirit ran high at the time, and the King, with the Reforming Bishops, and the nobility, who were enjoying the fruits of the spoliation of the Religious houses, had at that time no dealings, save by way of persecution, with the opponents of the new order of things. Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and leader of this latter (the quasi-Catholic) party, was absent as ambassador in Paris during the whole of 1536 and 1537; and when he returned, more stirring events than the mere omission of a consecration were in progress, which may well have

the non-necessity of consecration. He answered the question, "Whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a Bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?" by these words,—“He that is appointed to be a Bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture.”

caused Barlow's condition to remain unnoticed.* For consecrations in those days were commonly performed in private chapels; and, as there was nothing corresponding to the modern facilities for the diffusion of news, the absence of any public knowledge of such an event having taken place would have been no reason for suspecting that it had not. This may certainly account for the ignorance of his Chapter at St. David's (then commonly a seven days' journey from London), of his non-Episcopal character, supposing it to have been such. And his brief connection with the See of St. Asaph would have furthered the possibility of his assuming unchallenged Episcopal functions without consecration, when he was translated to St. David's. Moreover, no one outside the King's most intimate circle could have had any ground *à priori* for anticipating that consecration would of set purpose be neglected. Certain ecclesiastical officials and the Bishops and nobles in attendance at Court would, of course, have been aware of the state of things; but the fear of Henry and Cromwell was ever before their eyes; and the remembrance of the martyrdom of Cardinal Fisher and of Sir Thomas More, the previous year, for resisting the Royal will, would have effectually sealed their lips. Nor could they be sure that consecration would not come in time. There was nothing unprecedented in a priest being invested with Episcopal jurisdiction and temporarily governing his diocese before he

* The topics that would mainly occupy the public mind at this time may be briefly noted in this connection. Anne Boleyn was executed in May, 1536; and in the course of the seven succeeding years Henry married four more wives. In 1536 the smaller, and in 1539 the greater monasteries were dissolved by Act of Parliament. In 1537 was born the Prince, who afterwards succeeded as Edward VI. In 1538 Henry was excommunicated by Paul III., and was occupied in suppressing the "Pilgrimage of Grace," and in procuring the execution of the Countess of Salisbury, the aged mother of Cardinal Pole. In 1539 the Catholic party succeeded in passing the "Six Articles;" and in 1540 Cromwell was beheaded; the period, which has been described as "the English Reign of Terror," thus coming to an end.

was consecrated. Bonner himself is adduced as an example. It is said that he was elected and confirmed Bishop of Hereford in October, 1538, and was translated to London in October, 1539, but was not consecrated until April, 1540.* And Bishops-elect were in those days not infrequently styled Bishops; though, of course, Bishops duly consecrated and confirmed in the possession of a See were never styled Bishops-elect, as Barlow was by Cromwell in June, 1536.

We submit, then, that the concealment of such an omission cannot be regarded as in those days so utterly impossible as it certainly would be now; and that the knowledge of his condition (the hypothesis of non-consecration being assumed throughout), which some few persons at least must have shared with Barlow at the first, may soon have died out in those stormy times. "Many of the arguments tending to show the unlikelihood of the omission, such as its apparently unprecedented character, the want of apparent motive, or again the exceedingly imperfect character of the registration, tend also to diminish the chances of detection. And, though Barlow was not a man inclined to sacrifice much to his convictions, yet he had a hearty hatred for sacerdotalism, a strong sense of humour, and, if we may judge from the sermon quoted above, the impudence if not the courage of his opinions. A competitor for a tyrant's favour must always risk something to keep a front place; and on this point he knew how the King was minded. Altogether he would seem to be by no means an unlikely man to have played the part assigned to him." †

Anglicans have indignantly protested against Barlow's

* Such, at least, is the statement of Godwin; but it is questioned by Kenrick, "*Anglican Ordinations*," p. 148.

† "*Catholic World*," vol. xix. p. 479.

consecration being questioned, on the ground that, as he passed for a Bishop until the day of his death, it ought to be taken for granted unless it can be disproved. But to prove that such an event never took place is, of course, next to impossible. Evidence that Barlow himself confessed he had never been consecrated would be necessary for this ; and the hypothesis of his non-consecration implies every effort on his part to conceal his real condition. No doubt his Episcopal character would have been closely scrutinised, and its imperfection (supposing it to have existed) almost certainly discovered on the accession of Mary ; but he evaded the investigation by promptly resigning his See (Bath and Wells at that time),* recanting Protestantism, so as to be able to escape to Germany, whence he returned, a kind of *Deus ex machinâ*, on Elizabeth's accession, in time to found the Anglican Hierarchy.

Catholics do not pretend to be able to prove that Barlow was never a Bishop ; what they contend is that there is nothing to show that he was ; while there is evidence of such an omission sufficiently serious to arouse grave suspicions ; and that therefore the burden of the proof lies with those who are bound to maintain that his consecration actually took place. The absence of the usual record of the event would not by itself mean much ; though certainly a blank space is more significant than the mere loss of a *feuille volante* ; but it is noticeable that in every

* Barlow obtained the lucrative See of Bath and Wells on the accession of Edward by means of a simoniacal agreement with the Protector Somerset, to whom he made over some of the endowments. *Vide* Mr. Bailey's "Defence," pp. 38, 42, 43. It is noticeable that nearly all the records we have of Barlow's Episcopal acts are concerned with temporal matters, and present his character as that of a man who knew how to temper avarice with worldly wisdom. Two causes seem to have brought about his various translations, which, it will be observed, were never promotions to more dignified Sees—the love of money, and the hatred he inspired wherever he took up his abode.

case, save Barlow's, where the record is not forthcoming, collateral evidence of the event can be produced. Nor is this all.—“Canon Estcourt points out that although there was no regular Register kept at St. David's,—and we know that the Breviaries and Martyrologies which contained records of Episcopal succession were burnt in the next reign as superstitious,—yet that it is sufficiently odd that all the Chapter books have been lost, and that the *Liber Computi*, still extant, has a break in it for several years before 1539.”* And another circumstance arousing the suspicion that in the early days of the controversy on Anglican Orders there was a want of straightforwardness in regard to the records which would be consulted on Barlow's case, is this, that Mason, who about the year 1625 was the first to defend his Episcopal *status* against Dr. Champney, who had been the first to impugn it, in quoting to that end the grant of temporalities to which reference has been made above, reproduced it so imperfectly as to conceal its exceptional character, and gave a wrong reference to the place where it could be found (“out of the Rolls Chapel in Chancery”); apparently with the view of preventing it from falling into other hands; and so far successfully that it is only within the last few years that the deed has again been discovered in the office of the Exchequer. Further evidence of tampering with the documentary evidence of the original Anglican succession will come before us later.

Whether Barlow was a Bishop or no, he was certainly a worthless man. He was one of the first to lapse from the faith into advanced Protestant opinions, and was exceptionally coarse and violent in his abuse of the old religion. He married also, in spite of his solemn profession of perpetual chastity both as priest and monk.

* “Catholic World,” vol. xix. p. 478.

He was the willing tool of Henry, Cromwell, and Cranmer, the three chief instruments in effecting the English Reformation, so far as it was brought about in Henry's reign; and he gave them considerable aid in their sacrilegious spoliation of the Religious Orders. And, in spite of his disbelief in Catholic doctrine, he acted consistently as a Bishop, confirming and ordaining, &c., and he even coöperated in the consecration of two Reforming prelates. But it never fell to his lot to act the part of principal Consecrator, until, with Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale, he laid hands on Parker, and said "Take the Holy Ghost."

That he was selected to fill this office on so important an occasion may be claimed as evidence that his Episcopal character was not then doubted. Certainly Parker can hardly have been ignorant of his condition, for he had himself been a Court chaplain at the time of the supposed consecration; though the others may very well have known nothing of the case. But, however that may have been, enough is now known of the opinions of the Anglican Reformers on the nature of ordination and consecration, to justify the assertion that, provided Barlow was legally recognised as a Bishop, his not having received Catholic Episcopal character would not in those times have been regarded as sufficient to disqualify him from acting the principal part in a Protestant consecration. What the promoters of Parker's consecration (and, we may add, Parker himself) desired, was, not his endowment with the spiritual powers of the *Summum Sacerdotium*, but his becoming invested, by means of some ceremony which should be as little offensive as possible to both the Catholic and Puritan parties, with the *prestige* of the traditional Episcopal authority. And, to effect this, Barlow, whether a true Bishop or no, was *facile princeps* among the four

officiants. Of Hodgkins's consecration there was, indeed, no doubt, and he was only one year junior to Barlow. But he was a mere Suffragan, had never governed a diocese, and had never sat in Parliament.* Scory or Coverdale, as Edwardine Bishops, might have been more acceptable to the ultra-Protestant party, and especially the latter, who was, in fact, a genuine Puritan.† But they were some fifteen years junior to the other two, and Scory at least was in no way a man of note. In comparison, then, with his three assistants Barlow was decidedly an important personage. It is true that, although four Sees can claim the honour of some connection with his name (St. Asaph, St. David's, Bath and Wells, and Chichester), he was a Bishop without a diocese at the time of Parker's consecration.‡ But he had been

* Hodgkins had been consecrated under the Erastian Act of 1535, which was not, as is sometimes supposed, designed to promote the spiritual efficiency of the Church of England, but was an attempt to secure its subordination to the Royal Ecclesiastical Supremacy (as Elizabeth afterwards succeeded in doing), by creating, as titular Suffragans, a new class of Bishops dependent on the Crown. In accordance with its provisions, within three years of its being passed (it became a dead letter with the temporary Catholic revival), Bishops were consecrated, chiefly by Cranmer, for Ipswich, Thetford, Colchester, Penrith, Shrewsbury, Marlborough, Dover, Bedford, Taunton, and Shaftesbury. The Act provided that "no such Suffragan shall use jurisdiction or Episcopal power otherwise or longer than shall be limited by such commission to him given." Some have thought a consecration performed with such a condition would be of doubtful validity; just as a marriage contract, intended to be subsequently dissoluble at will, would be probably null. But it is better to regard the condition as merely introducing a grave irregularity. The Act in question has recently been revived.

† The Edwardine Bishops were "consecrated" with a condition similar to that of Henry's Suffragans:—*Quamdiù se benè gesserint*.

‡ Some Anglican writers have endeavoured to maintain that he was Bishop of Bath and Wells on Elizabeth's accession, his deprivation by Mary being regarded as illegal. But, in truth, he was not deprived. He himself resigned the See, no doubt having deprivation in view if he did not; and the theory is further rendered untenable by the fact that Elizabeth's first commission for the consecration of Parker was addressed to Bourne, Bishop of Bath and Wells, as well as to Barlow; the former being thus acknowledged as no intruder, and the latter as having no diocese.

intimate with King Henry ; he was acceptable to Elizabeth as having been a defender of the legitimacy of her father's marriage with her mother, Anne Boleyn ; and, above all, he had been for many years a spiritual peer, and had sat in the House of Lords. The mere question of Orders apart (and this anyhow was not a matter of public notoriety), he was decidedly the man to give to the Elizabethan Hierarchy that kind of continuity with the past which alone she and her advisers desired. He was therefore selected to take the principal part in Parker's consecration ; although, significantly enough, in what some take to be the earliest record of that event, written, very probably, when Barlow was still living, while the precise dates of their consecrations and of the officiating Bishops are given in the case of each of his three assistants, the Registrar can say no more of Barlow than that he was "consecrated in the time of Henry VIII.," without any further specification of names or day.

We proceed next to consider the circumstances of Parker's consecration, first giving our reasons for insisting on Barlow being described as his Consecrator, and not merely as one of four who could equally claim that title.

§ 39. *The Coöperation of the Assistant Bishops at a Consecration.*

There is a noteworthy testimony to the justice with which Catholics have challenged Barlow's Episcopal *status*, in the fact that the recent defenders of the Anglican claim, with one or two exceptions, have endeavoured to prove that a Bishop-elect is really consecrated, if the assistant Bishops, or even if only one of them, have true Episcopal character, though the principal officiant has not. They have, of course, been driven to adopt this position, which will be found to be extremely precarious, by the controversial exigences of their claims ; for there can be nothing in the theory itself that should make it otherwise peculiarly attractive to Anglicans. They profess, however, their readiness, in the matter of Parker's consecration, to give up Barlow, if necessary, and to make the validity of the act depend on any one of the other three. In following out this line of argument they have commonly been content to rest their conclusion on the coöperation of Hodgkins, who was, no doubt, a true Bishop.* But, since their reasoning, if it is good for anything at all, assumes the sufficiency of the Edwardine rite to consecrate Parker, it is inconsistent not to claim Episcopal character for Scory and Coverdale as well, since they had been consecrated by it.

Originally this extreme doctrine of coöperation was only used to cover doubts concerning Barlow ; but later writers, and notably Dr. Littledale, have more widely applied it,

* Thus, Mr. Perceval, in his "Apology for the Apostolical Succession," p. 220, coolly sets down Hodgkins as Parker's Consecrator, and Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale as his assistants, in a table in which he traces the descent of Archbishop Howley (1823) from Archbishop Warham (1520).

and now confidently assert that the Anglican succession has been "strengthened" by the coöperation of De Dominis, an apostate Italian Archbishop, in one or two Anglican consecrations in the year 1617,* and by similar coöperation on the part of certain Irish prelates from time to time.

On this it may be observed that, if the succession has existed continuously in the Church of England, it would not be materially "strengthened" by such acts as these ; but that, if it is meant that such coöperation actually mended a broken chain, this ought to be plainly stated ; and then the assertion will stand or fall with the alleged consecration of Parker by the assistant Bishops. Certainly, the notion of valid Orders thus coming in as through a side door, and in the course of a century or so gradually permeating the whole Establishment, is grotesque enough to call for no serious refutation ; nor did the Anglican Church of the eighteenth century show much sign of having thus become fully endowed with sacramental grace. And it is, moreover, singular that High Churchmen should be willing to look to the Irish Protestant Church for the support of a sacerdotal claim.† Nevertheless, the theory

* Mark De Dominis, ex-Archbishop of Spalatro, who conformed to the Church of England for a time in the reign of James I., was made Dean of Windsor, and assisted in one or two Episcopal consecrations, taught heresy on the Sacrament of Holy Order. He held that Episcopal authority was nothing but the delegation of power from the people, and that consecration was a mere ceremony through which Bishops become qualified to exercise that power which belongs of right to laity as well as clergy. He appears to have been a peculiarly unstable man ; but he had the happiness to recant his errors, and to be reconciled to the Church before his death. See Jervis, "Church of France," vol. i. pp. 287-289. As to the effect of his "coöperation" in Anglican consecrations, it may be noted that it was previous to the insertion of those words into the Anglican form which give it a greater show of validity ;—not that in any case his act could have validated the consecration ; for all he did was to impose his hands in silence ; and they who believe that he would thus independently confer the Episcopate, may prove their opinion if they can.

† It is true that the original Anglo-Irish Protestant succession presents no

in question is widely accepted among Anglicans, who even go on to assert that it is the Catholic doctrine as well. We must therefore examine it, and ascertain how far it can claim to be thus regarded.

It is, perhaps, a little remarkable that they who adopt this extreme view of the effect of coöperation, should not perceive that the mere fact of a controversy having existed for some three hundred years as to whether Parker and Barlow had actually been consecrated, is *primâ facie*

historical difficulty similar to that which renders Barlow's Episcopal character so questionable ; but, at the same time, the early history of the attempt to impose Anglicanism on Ireland is so scandalous a record of tyranny and lawlessness that one would need the profoundest faith in a special Providence over Irish Protestantism to be able to feel any confidence in its having transmitted, even for a short period, the Catholic *Sacerdotium*, whatever rite it may have used. An incident will soon come before us significant of the character of the original Irish succession. And it may be well here to notice a common Anglican error as to the origin of the Irish Protestant Church. A legend is in possession to the effect that "the Reformation was accepted, with scarcely a dissentient voice, by the whole Irish Episcopate." The truth is that not a single Irish Bishop accepted the Reformation. Curwen, Archbishop of Dublin, the only prelate in Ireland who apostatised, was an Englishman ; and through him alone can be traced the succession of those Irish Bishops who assisted at certain English consecrations. In 1563 he used the Anglican Ordinal to "consecrate" Loftus to Armagh ; and on the validity of this act Irish Protestant Orders depend. Loftus was a good-looking youth, who had attracted Elizabeth's attention at Court ; and as successor of St. Patrick he distinguished himself chiefly by his unscrupulous avarice, appropriating to his own use every benefice that fell vacant. After a few years he "consecrated" Lancaster as his successor, and retired himself to Dublin to enjoy the fruits of his shameless spoliation. Meanwhile, in spite of much persecution, the Catholic succession remained unbroken ; and Dublin alone, which was at that time little else than a garrison city of the English, lacked a Catholic Archbishop for some short time. Indeed, into but few of the ancient Sees was there any attempt made to thrust a Protestant prelate until the beginning of the seventeenth century. The Protestant Church secured the endowments and desecrated the buildings which the piety of old Ireland had provided for the due celebration of the Mass ; but the assertion that it is the legitimate representative of the Church of the Irish Saints has been justly described as "the most impudent falsehood in all history." See Dr. Maziere Brady's "Episcopal Succession in Ireland," and "The Alleged Conversion of the Irish Bishops ;" and compare Froude's "History of England," vol. x. p. 481. The existing Orders in the Irish Protestant Church are referred to in the last Note appended to this Essay.

evidence against their opinion. For it is known that Hodgkins coöperated with Parker on December 21st, 1559, in consecrating Grindal, who is one of the links in the Anglican chain ; so that, if the coöperators are actual consecrators, all the time and labour that have been spent on the cases of Barlow and Parker have been simply thrown away. Mr. Bailey, who has carefully amassed the evidence in regard to these two, does not appear to make anything of the effect of coöperation ; herein following Courayer, who, partisan as he was, knew Catholic theology too well to defend Anglican Orders by the use of an assumption at once precarious and extravagant. On the other hand, Dr. Littledale, with characteristic audacity, says in his tract on Anglican Orders, already referred to, " As regards the office of co-consecrators, the fact is that the primæval and Nicene Canons requiring three Bishops to take part in every consecration, were intended expressly to guard against any chance of invalidity, so that B and C might supply any defect of A. And so Martène lays down." Martène, it appears, if he says anything that suits the Anglican theory, infallibly defines ; and against his sentence there is no appeal. But, in truth, his doctrine in this matter is that which Catholics commonly hold, though it is not what Dr. Littledale makes it to be. Much more has been put on his words than they will fairly bear. He does not say that the assistants consecrate equally with or independently of the Consecrator. And, so far from suggesting that their coöperation is intended to secure the act from all chance of *invalidity*, he expressly asserts that it is to secure *regularity*,—a very different thing. His words are these :—*An vero omnes qui adsunt episcopi coöperatores sint an testes tantum consecrationis inquiri posset. Verum non tantum testes, sed etiam coöperatores esse, citrà omnem dubitationis aleam asserendum*

est. Having stated this position, which we fully accept, he goes on to point out that their assistance was directed by the early Canons and Councils as a precaution against the consecration of a heretic,—a fact which explains the privilege of the Pope in being able to consecrate alone : *Id propter hæreses institutum agnoscitur, ne aliquid contrà fidem Ecclesiæ uniusordinantis tyrannica auctoritas moliretur. A quâ suspitione immunis esse debebat Romani Pontificis sanctitas.** Clearly then, Martène does not make coöperation a necessary guarantee of validity, nor is he contemplating the possibility of the principal Consecrator not being a Bishop himself. And the theologians to whom Canon Estcourt refers, maintain the same view.† Only one, Hallier, defends the opinion that the assistant Bishops are properly consecrators ; and he does so only speculatively, not as giving his own judgment, but by way of illustrating the position of those who held that the presence of three Bishops was absolutely necessary to secure a valid consecration ; an opinion which is not now maintained.‡ Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the Catholic impugnors of Anglican Orders have been unanimous in holding that the non-consecration of Barlow would be a fatal flaw in the Anglican succession ; a fact which is

* “De Ant. Eccl. Rit.,” Lib. i., cap. viii. Art. x., § 16. On the same grounds the Pope can dispense other Bishops from the necessity of consecrating not without assistants.

† “Anglican Ordinations,” pp. 109–114.

‡ It was, however, formerly held by such distinguished theologians as Cajetan, Bellarmine, and Vasquez that a consecration by fewer than three Bishops could only be valid in virtue of a Papal dispensation. But this doctrine does not make the assistants to be *independent* consecrators ; on the contrary, it implies that the two assistants, granting that they are true consecrators, would not effect a valid consecration in the case of a lack of Episcopal character in the principal officiant. The whole question is fully discussed by Hallier, “De Sacris Electionibus et Ordinationibus,” Part ii., § v., chap. ii., Art. 2. He concludes that the opinion which makes the coöperation of the assistants not to affect the substance and validity of the consecration is *longè probabilior*. Tournely, however, is strong on the other side.

sufficient by itself to show that they did not accept Dr. Littledale's view of coöperation.

But we must proceed to apply to the case in hand the principles which have here been indicated, and which will receive further illustration as we proceed. It is only on the consecration of Parker that they have any serious bearing. The accounts of that event (which we must assume to be accurate, though there is nothing to support their testimony), agree in stating that Barlow, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale all said aloud: "Take the Holy Ghost;" though apparently Barlow alone said the rest of the form.* Now, if this be a correct statement of what occurred, it is clear that they did not follow the rubric in the book they were using; for this directs only the Arch-

* In this connection may be noticed a singular error into which Dr. Pusey has fallen. He says ("Eirenicon," i., p. 232), that at Parker's consecration the precedent of Chichele's was carefully followed; and that this one was selected because it took place at a time when the English Church acknowledged no Pope; that in 1559 the tradition of this consecration was a century old; and that it was providential that "Parker and his consecrators" should have such a precedent to fall back upon. Mr. Bailey, noting the statement ("English Orders and Papal Supremacy," p. 28), observes that it is "a very important fact." If it had been a fact at all it might have been important; but the whole assertion is from first to last a mistake. Chichele was consecrated by the Pope himself, Gregory XII., at Siena, in 1408 (a long "century" before 1559), and there can have been no special "tradition" about his consecration. The only point about it was that, as it took place in Italy, the Roman Pontifical was used instead of the Sarum; and there is some reason for supposing that, by way of assimilating Chichele's consecration to the ordinary English use, the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* were (perhaps for the first time), introduced into the Roman Pontifical; and that the fact of their having been thus employed was thought worthy of being recorded in the Register. The ceremony, then, differed from what was usual in England only in being exceptionally Roman, and so was least of all calculated to form a "precedent" for "Parker and his consecrators." There is not a particle of evidence that they had it in their minds as such; indeed, the supposition is wholly outside the limits of probability. It is a pure assumption founded, if on anything at all, on Dr. Pusey's confused remembrance of the solitary fact that the use of the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* at Chichele's consecration (of course only as introductory to the usual form), is recorded in the Register of that event.

bishop to say the words ; and, as there are no grounds for supposing that in any other Anglican consecration the rubric has been departed from, it follows that in Parker's case there was a more distinctly marked coöperation than there has been subsequently. Now, we do not, of course, deny that by imposing their hands in silence the assistant Bishops do really coöperate in the act ; but it is clear that under such circumstances they cannot be regarded as independent administrators of the Sacrament of Holy Order, for they employ no form. On these grounds, therefore, we put out of the question the alleged coöperation of De Dominis and of the Irish Bishops. If Anglican Orders were valid after that interposition, they were so before ; but not otherwise.

Returning, however, to Parker's case, we inquire for what reason it was that the Anglican rubric was not strictly followed ; and what special efficacy, if any, we can attribute to what was done in virtue of that violation. Three explanations seem to be possible. The most probable is that, as there was no Archbishop among them, they sought to make that deficiency good (a deficiency which in their minds would have been legal rather than spiritual), by thus joining their forces. Or, again, they may have actually intended to supply what they knew was wanting in Barlow. Or, lastly, they may have sought thus to assimilate their act, as far as possible, to a Catholic consecration. For it must be borne in mind that, if Parker's consecration is to be tested by Catholic principles, there was nothing exceptional in the four uniting in the imposition of hands, and in saying, " Take the Holy Ghost." All rites for Episcopal consecration agree in directing the assistants to unite in the matter of the Sacrament ; and when the words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* were in mediæval times introduced into the rite, and so

prefixed to the form which the Consecrator says alone, the assistants appear always to have joined in reciting those words ; though it is true that the rubric of the Sarum Pontifical did not direct them to do so ; whereas the Exeter Pontifical agreed in this matter with that of the Roman Church.

If, then, Parker's consecration is to be regarded as a Catholic consecration (and this is, of course, the view that High Churchmen are bound to take of it), we submit that there was no coöperation on the part of Hodgkins and the others more efficacious than what is usual in ordinary consecrations, and that therefore there are no grounds for judging it by other than the ordinary rules of Catholic theology. But, if one or other of the former explanations of their disregard of the Anglican rubric be accepted, and we are called upon to allow that all four said the words, "Take the Holy Ghost," with the special and exceptional intention of removing all possible doubt about the validity of the act, and that therefore Parker had four independent consecrators, on any one of whom his Episcopal character can be made to depend, we have only to say that this may be Anglican, but it is not Catholic theology, and that such a consecration cannot be treated as an administration of a Catholic Sacrament at all. The Church knows only of one principal Consecrator, with whom the assistants coöperate ; and one out of the four must be selected to occupy this position in Parker's consecration, else the validity of the act cannot, on Catholic principles, be entertained at all.

Now, there can be no question as to the principal officiant in Parker's case. Barlow did all that corresponded to the special acts of the Consecrator in a Catholic consecration. To him Parker was presented by the others, with these words, "Reverend Father in God, we present to

you (*tibi*) this godly and learned man that he may be consecrated Archbishop." He alone among the Bishops present wore a cope ; he it was who performed the Communion service,* and so he alone would have said the prayers on which, according to Courayer's theory, the validity of the Anglican rite depends. And, what is still more to the point, a document more fully referred to below, which appears to be a copy of Parker's Register in its original form, plainly describes Barlow as *Consecrator* and the others as *assistentes*.

Allowing, then, that Parker's consecration may be judged by the principles of Catholic theology, we maintain that Barlow must be regarded as the principal officiant therein ; and, bearing in mind the doubtfulness of his Episcopal character, we proceed to ascertain more accurately how far the coöperation of the assistant Bishops in a Catholic consecration contributes to the completeness and validity of the act.

That they are more than witnesses seems to be clear from the part that they take in the ceremony. They assist the Consecrator, and confirm his act. Not that it follows that his act would be incomplete without them ; for the mass of theologians recognise with the utmost distinctness that the chief officiant *totam efficit consecrationem* ; and they who insist most strongly on the necessity of the presence of the assistants, admit that they

* In accordance with the Catholic doctrine of intention which has been discussed above, we may safely assert that Barlow did not say Mass at Parker's consecration, though as a priest he was capable of doing so. Whether the absence of a true Eucharist at an Episcopal consecration would hinder the validity of the act may fairly be questioned. Certainly it would be a grave irregularity ; and at the ordination of a priest it would probably be even more ; for on the latter the Eucharistic celebration has such intimate bearing in matter, form and intention, that it is difficult to see how a "priest" ordained otherwise than in the course of the Mass could be accounted a "Mass-priest." All valid rites in East and West alike witness to this indispensable accompaniment.

act *per modum unius*, for the *opus* is one and not manifold.*

There is no doubt of the urgency with which the ancient Canons demand the presence of at least three Bishops at a consecration; and so strongly is the necessity felt by the Church that a consecration by one Bishop is not held to be safe, unless a special dispensation have been obtained. But there is no evidence that the Canons in question had in view the *validity* of consecrations; and, until this is proved, the act of the coöperators cannot be regarded as essential to the Sacrament, much less as an independent consecration. Anglican writers have put their own construction on these disciplinary rules; and some have even gone so far as to make a silly retort against the Catholic Church, and to question the validity of her succession in certain cases, because in the plenitude of her power she has sometimes dispensed with this rule. Did they belong to the living Church, instead of to a Branch which has for three hundred years been cut off and withered, they would be able to appreciate the justice with which she applies, or does not apply, her canons of discipline to this or that case. Outside her fold there is, of course, nothing but the bare letter to take as guide; within it the living spirit suggests, directs, and controls her acts. Nor is

* In support of a strong view of the effect of the coöperation of the assistant Bishops might be urged what at first sight appears to be a parallel case, viz., the "concelebration" of the newly ordained priests at the ordination Mass. Theologians commonly hold that, by thus participating in the rite, they would actually consecrate the Holy Eucharist, should the Bishop omit the words of institution. But the two cases are really distinct. The new priests intend, and are intended by the Church, thus for the first time to exercise the power they have just received in union with and in subordination to the Bishop; and thus minded they say the essential words of the form. On the other hand, the assistant Bishops do not intend actually to consecrate, but merely to confirm and give additional solemnity to the act of the Consecrator. They contribute to his act more as the deacon and subdeacon do to the Mass, than as the concelebrating priests. And the word "co-consecrators," though popularly used, is not found in theology or in liturgical books.

there any novelty in her permitting consecrations to be performed under certain circumstances by one Bishop alone. St. Augustine, of Canterbury, wrote to Pope Gregory I. for advice how to act in this matter ; and the answer he received was that so long as he was the only Bishop in the Church of the English, he could not do otherwise than act alone ; but that, when other Bishops had been consecrated, three or four should assemble at all future consecrations. But the Pope did not so much as hint that the consecration by a single Bishop would be in any sense less complete than these later ones ; indeed, he compared the position of the assistants to the presence at a wedding of other married couples, who come to rejoice with the bridegroom and the bride.* And what was the rule in the Catholic Church in those days is the rule now. Missionary Bishops sent to distant lands sometimes receive faculties to consecrate Bishops alone, if there be need ; and their act is perfectly regular and valid. But, on the other hand, under ordinary circumstances, where three Bishops may be had, a consecration by one alone would not be permitted ; and, if performed without permission, the Episcopal office thus received could not be exercised without a special dispensation ; and this, it is likely enough, would not be granted, though the validity of the act would not be denied. All this testifies to the care with which the Church protects her Sacred Orders ; to her living power which enables her to dispense with rules of her own making ; and to her intimate persuasion

* Bede's "Ecclesiastical History," Book i., cap. 27. Dr. Bright admits ("Early English Church History," p. 59) that the rule for a "plurality of consecrators," though very ancient, "was intended to guard against disorderly and clandestine consecrations ; and its observance was not deemed a *sine quâ non* for the conferring of the Episcopal character. Gregory's illustration from a wedding party is significant on this point."

that it is the Consecrator, and not the assistants, who really effects the act.

We have, however, admitted above that the assistants coöperate in and do not merely witness to the consecration, and we have no desire to withdraw from this position. But what is coöperation? Is it an action independent and complete in itself? This is what those Anglican writers, who are willing to give up Barlow, are bound to maintain. They must show that the coöperation of the assistants makes good all possible defects, even the want of Episcopal character, in the Consecrator himself. But this is a most precarious position, maintained by no single theologian; and, indeed, it cannot be defended without doing violence to the very word "coöperate." The term implies that there is some *opus* in progress to which the assistants contribute. And this *opus* is that which the Consecrator performs; but if he have not Episcopal character, he does nothing, and so there is nothing in which the assistants can take part. At the utmost they can only be said to integrate the act of the Consecrator; but if that act be null, their integration goes for nothing. Aaron and Hur did something more than witness to the lifting up of Moses' arms, they coöperated in the act; but the act was his and not theirs, and apart from him what they did would have had no efficacy. And similarly, in illustration, it may be noted that our Blessed Lady coöperated really and effectually in our redemption, but she is not on that account our Redemptress. To say, then, that the assistant Bishops really and effectually contribute to the consecration is one thing; but to say that they consecrate either equally with, or further, even independently of the Consecrator himself, so that their act is good apart from his, is quite another thing, and is not maintained by any Catholic writer; it is but a dubious deduction from a

rare opinion, and as such could not possibly be followed in practice.*

It may, of course, be objected that this exclusion of the assistants from participation in the validity of the act, throws a doubt over the Episcopal succession in all parts of the Church, by making it descend from the Apostles in single lines ; and that, therefore, the principle that "a threefold cord is not quickly broken" is more acceptable, as securing the valid transmission of Orders beyond all possible cavil. But this objection, if admitted at all, must be more widely applied. Anyhow, the Bishop-elect was baptised by only one person, perhaps even by a layman, and his priestly ordination was performed by a single Bishop, with only the coöperation of priests, which Anglicans admit would not make good the want of Episcopal character in his ordainer. And unless these two acts were valid, both of them, his subsequent Episcopal consecration by any number of Bishops would be null ; and it is obvious to remark that there would naturally be more scrupulous care to secure the accurate performance of this last ceremony, if only on account of its comparative rarity, than could reasonably be assumed in regard

* Dr. Lee quotes Oriental prelates as favouring what may, perhaps, be called the Anglican doctrine of coöperation. But their language is precisely such as Catholics would use. They do not contemplate the possibility of a non-Episcopal principal Consecrator ; and they refer especially to the witness of the assistants. Similarly, the sentence in the Greek rite for Episcopal consecration, which makes the Consecrator speak of the new Bishop as having been admitted to the High-priestly dignity "by the hand of me a sinner, and of the Ministers and fellow-Bishops here present," does not indicate an estimate of coöperation different from that which Catholics accept. The assistants contribute to the act ; but the act is not theirs. The rite does not acknowledge them as "consecrators" which is the view of their position that Anglicans would seek to maintain. A rubric at the end of the function speaks distinctly of "the Consecrator and the other Bishops." And in the East, in accordance with ancient usage, the assistants impose their hands in silence, and so cannot be regarded as independent administrators of the Sacrament. See the "Euchologion" (Venice, 1869), p. 181.

to the two earlier (but equally essential) acts, in which co-operation is not required.

All this points to the real scope of the Nicene and other Canons, which demand a "plurality of consecrators." Baptism is necessary for salvation ; and so, though originally its administration belonged to the Episcopal office, and was accompanied by various significant ceremonies, the Church dispenses with everything, in case of necessity, saving only the essential matter and form, and a *minimum* of intention ; and any one may validly baptise at any time or place. But with Episcopal consecrations it is different. Too great facilities for their performance would in all probability be abused to the detriment of the unity of the Church. They have therefore been fenced round with various safeguards—restrictions of time and place, the presence of more than one Bishop, and the like—so as to hinder, as far as may be, clandestine consecrations. A priest, unlawfully ambitious of Episcopal power, must secure the services of three Bishops as his accomplices ; and it is singular how scrupulous about such canonical regulations, which make a good show before the world, have from time to time been those who have sought illicit consecration. Novatian in early times, and Parker in later, are examples of this ; but examples also of failure, if we be not greatly mistaken. The *rationale* of co-operation is however clear. Present at the consecration of a brother-Bishop so as to witness, sanction, and confirm the act of the Archbishop, the assistants asserted their own dignity and character by uniting, originally in silence, in the imposition of hands. Coöperation of this kind was common in primitive times, even at the Eucharistic celebrations, but not with any view of validating an otherwise imperfect act. After the lapse of many centuries they united with the Consecrator in saying, as they do at this

day, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. But they did not thus change their position ; the Sacrament of Holy Order remained the same ; and they acted still as assistants and not as independent administrators of the rite. Every Catholic Bishop has strictly one Consecrator, and no more ; the presence of the assistants may give a moral strength to the consecration, but nothing else ; and unless the one principal officiant be a true Bishop, the ceremony itself is null.*

We contend, then, that unless Parker's consecration is to be regarded as an exceptional event, standing alone in the history of the Church, and not to be judged by ordinary rules, its validity (granting the sufficiency of the rite employed), depended entirely on Barlow's Episcopal character, the questionableness of which was pointed out in the section last above.

* The following case may be put :—"Archbishop A, attended by his chaplains E and F, is travelling to meet two other Bishops, B and C, personally unknown to him, in conjunction with whom he is to consecrate D, a priest, to the Episcopate. On the way he is taken ill; and his chaplains, unfortunately not the best of men, perceive that the opportunity is favourable for their obtaining possession of a considerable sum of Peter's Pence, which B and C were to deliver to the Archbishop when they met for the consecration. They therefore leave his Grace to recover as best he may ; and E, who is familiar with Pontifical functions, undertakes to personate his master, F witnessing to his identity. They meet B and C, and E assisted by them professes to consecrate D, all the details of the rite being duly observed, the two real Bishops therefore imposing their hands and saying with E, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*. What would theologians say as to the validity of such a consecration? It is conceivable that one or two might urge that D should be consecrated afresh *sub conditione*, to avoid any possibility of sacrilegious iteration ; but the vast majority would surely affirm the nullity of the act, and would demand unconditional consecration ; and it may be safely said that no one but Dr. Littledale and his disciples would tolerate the notion of D's acting as Bishop on the strength of his having been consecrated by the coöperation of B and C.

§ 40. *The Consecration of Matthew Parker.*

The main features in Parker's case have already been incidentally noticed. We have no intention of disputing the fact that on December 17th, 1559, a ceremony described as his consecration took place at Lambeth; nor do we propose to dwell further on the probable invalidity of the act; but attention must be called to the grossly irregular nature of the proceedings, and to the mystery in which it was thought desirable to shroud the event; and this we must do, partly with the view of defending the honesty of those Catholic writers who in former years refused to admit that the consecration had ever taken place; and partly with the view of further illustrating the nature and value of the Anglican Ministry, of which this consecration is the source.

Parker was a man of far higher character than Barlow, though he too, after lapsing from the unity of the faith, had violated his obligation to chastity and had married. But he had been consistent in his profession of the Reformed doctrine; he was a man of conservative temper, so far as it was possible for a Protestant of those days to claim such a title; and he united the great Anglican virtue of "moderation" with sincere piety, and views which were decidedly Erastian as to Church government, Calvinistic on predestination and grace, and mildly Zwinglian on the nature of the Sacraments.* He had been confessor to Anne

* In spite, however, of his natural gentleness of character, he appears as little else than a persecutor of the Puritans some six years after his consecration; and, according to Fletcher, his "ferocity" was only exceeded by that of Whitgift, who made ample amends for the remissness of Grindal in this respect. At a later period Laud cropped off the ears and slit the noses of the Nonconformists, and the prelates who came between the Restoration and the

Boleyn in old times, and so was acceptable to her daughter Elizabeth.

It appears from a letter addressed to him in 1568 by Jewell, whom he had consecrated Bishop of Salisbury, that they agreed in regarding Episcopal ordination as a matter of propriety, not essential to the validity of Sacraments. The letter concerned Thomas Lancaster, Protestant Archbishop-elect of Armagh, who had manifested the exuberance of his zeal for the Reformed religion by "ordering ministers" before he had been "consecrated" himself. Jewell begs Parker to "stay" him in these proceedings, but takes for granted that the Orders thus conferred would be accounted valid; indeed, his main ground of complaint is that Lancaster had thus indiscreetly "ordered" a man to whom he had himself ever since his "consecration" refused the favour.* This little incident is significant of the kind of ministerial succession that was transmitted in the Irish Protestant Church; and it also throws some light on Parker's views on the value of Episcopal consecration, about which he has himself left us no information.

The Queen's *congé d'élire* for the election of the Archbishop was issued on July 18th, 1559, and took effect on August 1st; when four Prebendaries appeared in Chapter at Canterbury, and accepted the nomination of the Dean, who had become a Protestant. Parker at once adopted

Revolution ran hot wires through their tongues. The action of the Anglican Bishops in these matters may, no doubt, be extenuated on the ground that it was due to the pressure of the State; but it may be doubted whether this defence really mends the case.

* It has been urged that Lancaster had been Bishop of Kildare before he was promoted to Armagh, and that therefore we must suppose he was already consecrated. But it is certain that he was consecrated on the occasion of his translation, three weeks after the date of the letter quoted above; and so we must conclude that, either he held the See of Kildare without consecration, or else that consecration was looked upon as a merely formal act, similar to confirmation or enthronisation, and therefore one that should be repeated when a Bishop was moved from one See to another.

the style and title of Archbishop, and was so addressed by the Queen. What, however, is more important, he obtained the temporalities of the See without either confirmation or consecration, and took up his residence at Lambeth in October ; where Tonstall, the Catholic Bishop of Durham, ousted from his See for refusing the oath of the Queen's Supremacy, was committed to his custody, and died after a month's imprisonment, November 18th, 1559.

It is important to observe that Parker was thus publicly acknowledged as Archbishop of Canterbury two months before he had obtained even nominal consecration ; for this fact was calculated to arouse the suspicions of the Catholic party, who could only judge of the intentions of the Anglican advisers of the Queen by their public acts. Of Parker's confirmation at Bow Church on December 9th, they would no doubt have knowledge ; but it is not easy to see how they could have obtained any trustworthy information concerning his subsequent consecration ; for it was an essentially private affair, at which no one but Parker's intimate friends and household, together with the Protestant Bishops-elect, were present ; and no official announcement of its having taken place was ever made.

Some Anglican writers, and notably Bramhall and Elrington, have laboured hard to prove that the consecration was in accordance with the laws of the Realm. It would be beside our purpose here to dispute this point ; and, indeed, its proof can only give satisfaction to those who accept the Erastian estimate of the position of the Church of England. But it is worth noting that Cecil himself, who had so much to do with the establishment of Anglicanism, appears to have doubted the strict legality of the proceedings ;* and it may have been the consciousness

* Canon Estcourt gives a fac-simile (p. 86) a Domestic State Paper of

of this irregularity which prompted the mystery and secrecy with which the event remained shrouded for more than fifty years. An act so exceptional in its circumstances, and so momentous in its consequences, would seem naturally to have demanded the widest publicity; and yet it was performed in a private chapel, before daybreak, in the presence of a few friends; and though some vague rumour of a consecration having taken place may have reached the ears of Catholics, it is impossible that they should have known the details of what had actually occurred.* We maintain, then, that they cannot fairly be accused of having refused to believe in a public fact, or of having deliberately invented a fable concerning the origin of the Anglican Hierarchy, if they readily accepted a story, which, though it did not appear in print until the close of Elizabeth's

Elizabeth, dated 1559, which is a sort of programme of the consecration, drawn up before it took place. There are marginal notes in Cecil's handwriting, admitting that it would be impossible to make the affair wholly legal. He points out that the services of an Archbishop, or of four Bishops, as required by a statute of Henry VIII., could not be obtained; and that at that time Edward's Ordinal had not been "established by Parliament."

* In addition to the questionable legality of the proceedings, and the irregularity, to say the least, as Catholics would regard it, of all concerned in the matter (for "Parker and his consecrators" were, of course, *ipsis factis*, excommunicate, and subject to every imaginable censure), there was a further strong reason in favour of privacy. It was impossible that the consecration should be publicly performed in a manner that would please the extreme parties on either side. The mass of the nation was Catholic in its sympathies; but a public and solemn use of the rite in the ancient Pontifical, while satisfying the people, would have rendered impossible the inclusion of the Puritans in the national religion; and they were the most active and aggressive party. On the other hand, the omission of any such ceremony, to please the Puritans, would probably have been distasteful to Parker himself, and would have scandalised the more conservative among the Protestants, who were also the ablest and most respectable among the adherents of the Queen's policy. At her accession this central or Anglican party can have consisted of but a very small minority of the nation; and so, while the fact and character of the consecration satisfied them, its privacy was rather favourable than otherwise to their plans, for it preserved it from the scorn which both Catholics and Puritans would certainly have showered upon it, had they seen what was actually done.

reign, seems to have been verbally reported from the first.

There was in Cheapside an inn, known as the "Nag's Head," not far from Bow Church, where the official confirmation of Bishops took place. It is not disputed that it was customary for those concerned in such acts to adjourn thither to dine when the ceremony was over. Nor is there any reason to doubt that such a dinner took place on Dec. 9th, 1559, after Barlow and the others had confirmed Parker in the usual form. That then and there they would proceed to discuss how the Archbishop was to be consecrated is only natural; for various difficulties, as we have seen, had delayed it a long time. But according to the legend (and it exists in more than one form), Scory thought it opportune to bid Parker and others kneel, and, laying a Bible on their heads, said, "Take thou authority to preach the Word of God sincerely," professing thus to consecrate them Bishops. Scory was, no doubt, a man of a jocular turn, and may in a convivial moment have done something of the kind; but, as Parker is known to have been confirmed on that day by proxy, he cannot have been present on the occasion (unless we are to suppose that he came specially for the dinner), and so the story, if it has any truth in it at all, contains nothing relevant to his elevation to the throne of Canterbury. It sounds, indeed, like a piece of waiter's gossip, and may be an exaggerated version of something that actually took place; and when we remember that Catholics had no means of knowing what occurred at Lambeth a few days later, and how suspicious they justly were of the proceedings of the Reforming divines, there is nothing wonderful in their having accepted this tale as a true account of Parker's pretended consecration, concluding that he himself must have been among the party at the Nag's Head,

as it was certainly his confirmation which had occasioned it. "The well-known disbelief in Orders prevailing amongst the Protestant party ; their repeatedly shrinking from the Catholic challenge to produce their proofs ; their insistance when speaking of their Episcopacy that ordination by a priest was valid—when taken together, justified Catholics in the growing suspicion that there was a terrible flaw somewhere, an irregularity which even an Elizabethan conscience stickled at. No one who reflects upon the genuine horror and contempt which the sight of the hen-pecked Bishops of England, with their woman Pope, excited throughout Christendom, can regard the Nag's Head story as an extravagant or gratuitous outcome of Catholic imagination." * The apparent inability of the Anglican party to produce any proof of Parker's consecration during the whole of Elizabeth's reign, must certainly have been taken as weighty evidence of its having never been duly performed. Thus, when Harding taunted Jewell with his Metropolitan and Consecrator having received no lawful consecration himself, the Bishop attempted no reply, though he did reply at length to some other objections. And there are other examples of the same suspicious reticence. Catholics of that day naturally concluded that Parker's non-consecration was the cause of this silence ; but we have now grounds for believing that it was due to a consciousness of the questionable legality of the act ; or else, as will shortly appear, to the discovery that Barlow's Episcopal character was not such as to satisfy those who had not wholly lapsed from the ancient faith.

Moreover, in order to do justice to the earlier Catholic impugnors of Anglican Orders, it must not be forgotten that they were precluded from all access to the official

* "Catholic World," vol. xix. p. 471.

documents attesting the fact of Parker's consecration. Evidence that some ceremony described as a consecration had taken place at Lambeth on Dec. 17th, 1559, they might perhaps have obtained ; but evidence as to the precise nature of that ceremony was to be found only in the Lambeth Register, and of the very existence of this document they must certainly have been ignorant. It made its first public appearance in 1613, being printed by Mason in his "Defence of Anglican Orders," which was published under the patronage of Archbishop Abbot ; and the unexpected production of so important a witness to an event which had occurred fifty-four years previously, and had been continually called in question, induced some Catholics to assert that the document was a forgery of Mason's—incorrectly, as it now appears, but surely not unreasonably under the circumstances, nor altogether unjustly in regard to Mason himself, for we now know that he did not deal honestly with the evidence concerning Barlow.

The questioning, however, of the genuineness of the Lambeth Register (which, with its strange gossiping details about carpets, dresses, &c., and its stage-like references to north and south entrances, must be admitted to be a singular official record), had the effect of bringing about an exception to that exclusion of Catholics from access to the original documents, which had hitherto been the rule, and which seems to have continued to be the rule until the present century. The exception is worth noting. In 1614, by command of Archbishop Abbot, four priests were brought up from prison, and were bidden by him to inspect (six other Anglican Bishops being also present), the palladium of the Anglican succession, the Register in question. It is difficult to see what satisfaction there could be to Catholics in an inspection made under such circumstances. The event itself was rather calculated to increase than to

allay their suspicions ; for these poor priests had need to be on their guard in the presence of seven bitter and powerful enemies ; and if it be true that one of them (F. Fairclough) did not fear to tell Abbot at the time that he still held to the Nag's Head story, on the authority of his father, who had kept a shop in Cheapside, and had told him that he had been present on the occasion, one may marvel at his courage, but one cannot justly say that he was doubly guilty of suppression or perversion of the known truth, after this gracious act on the part of the Archbishop.

Since that time incidental evidence has come to light testifying to the fact that a kind of consecration took place at Lambeth on the day alleged ; and, consequently, Catholic writers from Dr. Lingard's time onwards have rejected the Nag's Head story as irrelevant to the controversy, though some still maintain that it has foundation in fact. Nor does there seem to be any ground for denying that the account given in the Lambeth Register is substantially accurate ; though it is true that there is no evidence forthcoming to corroborate that account ; while the narrative itself, besides being, of course, the compilation of those who from the Catholic standpoint must be described as accomplices in the transaction, bears marks of having been carefully worded with a view to anticipated objections. This point is important, and must be more fully stated.

Canon Estcourt has shown, with proof that hardly falls short of demonstration, that the Lambeth Register, as it now stands, is not the original record of what took place, but rather a glossed version thereof, in which certain important and awkward facts, without being denied, are carefully suppressed.* There is a document preserved among

* "Anglican Ordinations," pp. 101-109.

Foxe's MSS. in the British Museum, which seems to be a copy of Parker's Register in its original form.* If it be compared with the existing Register, and with the duplicate copy in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge† (said to have been presented by Parker himself), it will be found that the official versions insert a good deal of irrelevant matter about the progress of the ceremony, thus obtaining the air of being the testimony of eye-witnesses, while they omit or modify plain statements, which the other MS. actually does contain. These omissions or alterations are mainly three, and their significance is at once apparent. The original document says that the second edition of Edward's Ordinal was used ; that Barlow was the Consecrator, and the other three his assistants ; and it appends the dates of their respective consecrations together with the names of their Consecrators ; though of Barlow it can only say *consecratus fuit tempore Henr. VIII.* The official versions, on the other hand, make no reference to the Ordinal of Edward VI., but say that the prayers used were *juxta formam libri auctoritate parlamenti editi* ; they make no distinction between Consecrator and assistants, but state that Parker was consecrated *per ipsos reverendos Patres auctoritate prædictâ [litterarum commissionarium Regiarum patentium eis directarum]* ; and they omit the note as to the consecration of Barlow and the others.

The conclusion from these facts seems to be inevitable. We cannot accept the official versions as simply straightforward and business-like records of what actually occurred. We may have no means of ascertaining how long a time elapsed between the consecration and the

* Canon Estcourt gives this important document in fac-simile, facing the title-page.

† There is a third copy in the Record Office.

engrossing of the deeds ; but it is clear that meanwhile the non-legality of the Edwardine Ordinal, and the questionableness of Barlow's Episcopal character had come to be regarded as facts damaging to the position of those who were anxious to maintain that the Anglican Church had preserved a true Episcopal succession ; and consequently such as should not be allowed to appear in the official narrative. The Lambeth Register, therefore, and its copy at Cambridge, must be regarded as "cooked" documents, and so far as unsatisfactory evidence ; but, at the same time, there is no good reason for doubting that they were written in Parker's lifetime ; so that, though the original Catholic impugnors of Anglican Orders were justly suspicious of the authenticity of the first-mentioned record, they were wrong in setting it down as a forgery of Mason's.

The account of the proceedings, which the Register contains, may give some satisfaction to Ritualists ; for the dresses of those who officiated, the arrangements and ornaments of the chapel, and such ceremonial details as were observed, are all minutely recorded, and give a High Church flavour to the whole, far beyond what has been usual at Anglican consecrations in later times.* It is only when the ritual is contrasted with that to which "Parker

* It is a small matter, yet deserving of notice, if not of protest, that Mr. Bailey in his English version of the Lambeth Register renders *ad sacra peragenda paratus* by the words "ready to celebrate the Blessed Sacrament." The expression "to celebrate" is sacrificial in character, and does not occur in the Prayer-book ; nor does the phrase "Blessed Sacrament." Both are commonly used by modern High Churchmen ; but they are out of harmony with the Anglicanism of the sixteenth century ; and their employment by Mr. Bailey in this place slightly colours the account of the proceedings. On the other hand, it is not easy to suggest another rendering. *Sacrum* in Catholic language commonly means "the Mass ;" but the use of the plural makes a difference, and no one will say that on this occasion Barlow was "prepared to celebrate Masses." Perhaps "ready to perform the sacred rites" is the best representation of the meaning of the Latin ; for *sacra* seems to be meant to include the act of consecration (which we contend was Barlow's), as well as the administration of the Communion.

and his consecrators " had formerly been accustomed as Catholic priests that its hollowness is detected. The Archbishop, we are told, first appeared in a " scarlet gown, and hood," and had " four wax torches borne before him." At the time of the consecration he wore a surplice, as did also Hodgkins and Scory ; while Barlow and his two assistants in the Communion Service were resplendent in " silk copes." The stern old Puritan Coverdale had no sympathy with this meaningless finery, and " used only a woollen gown, reaching down to his feet." At the end of the ceremony, Parker, Barlow, and Hodgkins put on what are described as " their Episcopal vestments," viz., " a surplice and chimere of black silk." Meanwhile Scory descended to the level of Coverdale, and wore only " a woollen gown ;" but the Archbishop seems to have gone so far as to invest himself with something that might perhaps pass for a pall ; for we are told that, in addition to his chimere, he " wore round his neck a certain collar made of valuable sables."

Such, then, were some of the surroundings of this redoubtable consecration, an event that passed almost unnoticed at the time, though since the beginning of the seventeenth century it has been the subject of much controversy. A man must be a strict Protestant and a decided Erastian to regard it with favourable eyes. No one but a Protestant can condone the substitution of the Edwardine Ordinal for the Catholic rites ; and no one but an Erastian can allow that the State could make good the host of irregularities under which all who took part in the proceedings laboured. The consecration of Dr. Reinkens in 1873 was a model of respectability by the side of Parker's.* And yet, in spite of all its shortcomings (and

* Modern High Churchmen seem to be wholly out of sympathy with the attitude of the early Church towards illicit consecrations ; save only when such

of course we do not acknowledge it to have been a true consecration), it must be regarded as an event of interest and importance; for it was the birth of the Anglican system, and all that that system essentially has been and is, depends upon it. And it is certainly singular, considering that those who took part in it had been baptised and educated as Catholics, that the whole tone of the proceedings should have been so characteristically Anglican. The Erastian language of the service indicated the foundation of the new national religion; while its inclusiveness was clearly manifested by the various gradations of ecclesiastical costume, from Genevan gown, black chimere, white surplice, scarlet gown and hood, up to "silk cope." This last is the culmination of genuine Anglican ritual, and it has of course no sacerdotal significance. The expressive insignia of the Catholic Church, the chasuble, stole, maniple, dalmatic, mitre, &c., were all absent. And this was the work of men to whom nothing of these things were strange. The nature and value of the Anglican Ministry in relation to the Catholic Priesthood are witnessed to pretty clearly by the accompaniments of Parker's consecration, when it is remembered how it came to be what it was.

consecrations are prejudicial to the unity of their own communion. Their fraternisation with the "Old Catholics" is an instance in point. Dr. Reinkens' Episcopal character appears to be certain; for he and the Bishops who constitute his pedigree have been carefully consecrated with due intention and the Catholic rite. Yet that character would almost certainly receive no honourable recognition should he have the happiness of being reconciled to the Church. He would be allowed to act as priest, but not as Bishop. And the strictness of Catholic discipline in this matter may be recommended to the notice of the founders of the "Order of Corporate Reunion." Assuming their own statements to be correct, they should yet remember that, should any of their Bishops or priests become Catholics, they certainly would not be allowed to act as such on the strength of Orders so unlawfully obtained; and it may be doubted whether they would even be allowed to proceed to conditional ordination; so grave is the ecclesiastical crime which they boast of having committed.

§ 41. *Character of the Original Anglican Claim to an Apostolical Succession.*

Already we have to some extent anticipated the answer to the question, "What claim to the possession of valid Orders has been put forth by the Anglican Church? Has this claim always existed, and has it been always the same?" If we can show that, at least in its early days, Anglicanism did not profess to be in possession of Orders differing in kind from those of the foreign Protestants; that the first assertion of an Anglican Apostolical Succession had to do with an alleged Apostolical form of Church government, and was not intended to involve a claim to the possession of sacerdotal powers; and that therefore the modern doctrine (that Anglican priests are such in the Catholic sense) has really little in common with the primitive belief in Anglican Orders—we shall have added an important witness to the correctness of our estimate of the nature of the Anglican Ministry; and we shall have further vindicated the conduct of the Catholic Church in steadily refusing to regard Anglican Bishops and priests, judged by her own standard, as more than mere laymen.

During the reign of Elizabeth Catholics had no theological controversy with Anglicans on the question of Orders. And the reason of this is not far to seek. What Anglicans did not assert Catholics had no call to deny.* The Elizabethan clergy had no thought of professing that

* The only other possible theory to account for this absence of controversy, viz., that the validity of Anglican Orders was allowed on all hands, is negated by the fact that throughout Elizabeth's reign convert Anglican clergymen were ordained unconditionally *ab initio*, without a word of protest from either Catholics or Anglicans. See above, p. 123.

their ordination empowered them to say Mass and absolve. It was enough for them that they had the Royal authority to support their ecclesiastical position ; and they fervently denounced as anti-Christian those sacerdotal acts which are now maintained to be the legitimate functions of Anglican clergymen. Catholics who in Elizabeth's reign attacked the new national religion, such as Harding, Sanders, Stapleton, Bristow, and Parsons, contented themselves with describing Anglican ministers as "meere laymen," or else with disputing the legality of their position. In doing this they did not, of course, mean to imply that their ecclesiastical *status* was otherwise unassailable. It was an *argumentum ad hominem*, addressed to those who made everything to depend on the laws of the Realm. So long as no one asserted that Parker, Grindal, or Whitgift were *Pontifices*, and that their ordination conferred the *Sacerdotium*, no one was called upon to take the other side.

And that Anglicans were sensitive to these attacks on the lawfulness of their Ministry, and could not deny their substantial justice, is shown by the following incident :—Bonner, the Catholic Bishop of London, had been deprived of his See to make room for Grindal, and had been imprisoned. An Act of Parliament had provided that the oath of the Queen's Supremacy should be tendered by Bishops to Bishops. And accordingly Horne, who had been "consecrated" Bishop of Winchester by Parker, appeared at the Marshalsea and tendered the oath to Bonner ; but he declined to be sworn by him, on the ground that Horne was not legally a Bishop—an objection which practically challenged the legal position of the new Hierarchy as a whole. This bold plea, as a correspondent of Cecil admits, "astonished a great number of the best learned, and they knew not what to answer him." In fact, his objection was allowed, and he was not further pressed

to take the oath ;* but the event resulted in the passing of the Act of 1565, referred to above, which was intended to place the position of the Anglican prelates beyond all possible cavil. And Jewell's silence, when taunted by Harding with the illegality of Parker's consecration, witnesses to the same consciousness of insecurity on the part of the Anglican Hierarchy.

Moreover, while Catholics attacked the lawfulness of Anglican Orders, inasmuch as there did not appear to be anything else in them substantial enough to be attacked, Anglican controversialists of the day were never tired of scoffing at the Catholic "massing-priests." Nor did they content themselves with explicitly repudiating the main function of a Catholic priest; they scoffed at his very Orders. Thus, Whitaker says, in reply to Durey, "I would not have you think we make such account of your Orders, as to consider no calling lawful without them. Therefore keep your Orders to yourselves." And Fulke, whom Canon Estcourt describes as "the official controversialist of the time, always kept in harness," in his reply to Bristow expresses himself thus, "With all our heart we abhor, defy, detest and spit at your stinking, greasy, anti-Christian Orders."† This is not the language of

* There are reasons for supposing (Estcourt, p. 108) that the record of Parker's consecration among Foxe's MSS. was drawn up with reference to this case. It contains an abstract of the Register of Bonner's consecration, followed by a relation of Parker's; and it would seem as if a retort against Bonner had been contemplated, on the ground that *his* consecration was not legal, having been performed by three Bishops instead of by four, as required by Henry VIII's. Act of 1534. If this be correct, it would follow that the Lambeth Register did not exist in its present form until after the Bonner-Horne incident, *i.e.*, not before 1563.

† "A Retentive to Stay Good Christians in the True Faith and Religion," London, 1580. Dr. Fulke, who in 1578 was appointed Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge, "had in this elevated station ample leisure to devote his talents to polemical theology; and that he advantageously availed himself of it is sufficiently evident from the numerous works he has left to posterity in

men whose Church had carefully retained the Catholic *Sacerdotium*.

But what, perhaps, is even more significant, when read in view of the uncertainty which shrouded the origin of the Anglican Hierarchy, is the language of Fulke and others, maintaining that under special circumstances a regular Episcopal succession may be dispensed with ; in other words, that it is a matter of propriety, but not of necessity. Such an admission would certainly confirm Catholics in their suspicion that Parker's consecration had never taken place ; though it was probably the knowledge that Barlow was only a priest which led to this acknowledgment of the sufficiency of Presbyterian ordination. Thus, Fulke gives his opinion that "where the Church hath been long exiled," (his reference is obviously to the banishment of the "Church of England" to Frankfort and other Protestant cities during Mary's reign) "an extraordinary form of ordination may be sufficient." And Whitaker continues thus, after the words quoted above, "God is not so tied to Orders, but that He can without Order, when the good of the Church requires, constitute ministers in the Churches." And the words of Hooker, already referred to, may be quoted again, for his preëminence among the Anglicans of his day makes his authority paramount : "There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a Bishop."*

vindication of the Reformed religion. He was also engaged in 1580 and following years in repeated disputations with the Papists, sometimes in the Tower, and once at least in Wisbeach Castle." Biographical Account, prefixed to his "Defence of the English Translations of the Bible" (Parker Society). This work was an attempted reply to an exposure of the numerous mistranslations and perversions of the text of Scripture (some of which still disfigure the Authorised Version), which were to be found in the Protestant Bibles circulated in England in Elizabeth's reign. Every page of it witnesses to Fulke's brutal character as a controversialist.

* "Ecclesiastical Polity," Book vii., cap. xiv., § 11. It should be noted, however, that these words of Hooker, though written in the last decade of the

When, then, we compare these admissions of Anglican writers with the documents issued by Elizabeth and her Parliament to make good all alleged defects in the *status* of the Anglican Hierarchy, we can hardly fail to conclude that, even among those who favoured the new system, there were men who had serious misgivings as to the validity of the succession of the Queen's Bishops. And under these circumstances there was no need for Catholics to question Anglican Orders on theological grounds, and to assert or prove that the Church of England had rejected the Catholic *Sacerdotium*. The Anglicans themselves, so far from pretending, indignantly denied that

sixteenth century, and evidently with reference to the state and official teaching of the Church of England, were not made public until more than sixty years after his death. The anonymous author of a pamphlet, entitled "Thoughts on some Questions of the Day" (Longmans, 1869), makes a good deal out of this delayed publication, as also out of the fact that Hooker was in constant communication with Cecil during the composition of the "Ecclesiastical Polity." Cecil himself had no Catholic sympathies; but he was particularly anxious to secure the conformity of the Catholic gentry; and he knew they could never accept the Anglican system without some more Catholic gilding. He made use, therefore (so our author thinks), of Hooker's genius and familiarity with Catholic phraseology to this end; at the same time furnishing him with accurate information concerning the true character of the Anglican succession. Hooker, as we now know, admitted both by his acts and words the sufficiency of non-Episcopal ordination; but his precise statement to that effect (quoted above), existed only in manuscript during the period of the Jacobite revival, whose promoters were straining every nerve to establish Anglicanism on the basis of its possessing a true Episcopal succession, as essential to the existence of "a Church." Portions of the sixth and eighth books were published during the reign of James I.; and our author gives serious reasons for believing that the High Churchmen of that day, knowing what fatal mischief to their cause would result from the publication of Hooker's admission, the prophet of their movement, deliberately withheld on one pretext or another the seventh book, in which the passage is contained, so that, in fact, it did not see the light until 1662, when the influence of the High Church party had prevailed, when the doctrine of the Anglican Episcopal succession had grown strong enough to stand alone (not a little through the writings of Bramhall, which had recently appeared), and when, moreover, the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal had been altered, so as to make Episcopal ordination in future a *sine quâ non*; the Anglican Ministry being thus, against Puritans at least, established in a secure position.

their priests had with Catholic priests the same functions to discharge.

We have seen already what was the effect of the new teaching on the nature and duties of the Christian Ministry in regard to the mode of public worship. The ancient ritual and devotional system was, in fact, utterly obliterated, in spite of the efforts of the Court party to retain the use of copes, together with a few details of ceremonial that had no doctrinal significance. There was a hollowness in this attempt, for it had in view only the personal dignity of the State Hierarchy. The Real Presence had been banished from the Cathedrals and churches; and what in former years had witnessed and done honour to it, was now employed to uphold the credit of the Royal religion. It was, in fact, a kind of jack-daw ritualism; "fine feathers make fine birds" was its only *rationale*, and it aroused the contempt of both Catholics and Puritans. Nor did it long resist, save in rare cases, the growing dislike for all religious ceremonial, which was only the logical outcome of a system that had excluded mystery from its worship; and in a short time it was quietly laid aside; though the chief officers of the Established Church were by no means disposed to surrender with their copes their temporal advantages, and what they conceived to be their legitimate authority.

But the effect of the Reformation had been to cut adrift from its ancient moorings the faith of the English people, and slowly but surely they tended more and more in the Puritan direction. This was, no doubt, in great measure due to the wide circulation obtained by the Genevan Bible, with its Calvinistic and anti-hierarchical notes; for as yet the Church of England had no authorised version of her own. The result was that about thirty years after Parker's consecration there arose the first

real controversy concerning the nature of the Anglican Ministry.

It was, however, no such controversy as that with which we are now concerned, for it was held with Puritans and not with Catholics. Controversy with Catholics was at this time conducted in a different style. Elizabeth and her Parliament having failed to extinguish the "Popish recusants" by an elaborate system of fines, confiscation, and imprisonment, proceeded in 1584 to make it high treason for any priest ordained abroad to come into the kingdom; and felony, also punishable with death, for any one to receive, relieve, or comfort such men.* Two hundred and sixty persons suffered death for their faith under this Act of Parliament during the last twenty years of Elizabeth's reign. No fewer than thirty-three, of whom twenty-two were priests, were executed during the last six months of the year 1588. It is true that they suffered in many cases ostensibly as traitors, and not simply as Catholics; but the charge of treason was merely a blind, as it always has been from the days of Pilate to those of Bismarck; and each martyr might have saved his life by a single act of conformity to the established religion.

But, while the Church of England was coöperating with the State in this effort to stamp out the ancient faith, she found that she had foes too among her own offspring. The rejection of the Papacy and of the Mass logically resulted in the rejection of Episcopacy and of all solemn liturgical order. Her own principles obtained a fuller

* It is worth noting that some of Elizabeth's cruel laws against Catholic priests have barely been repealed a century. Until their repeal it was a capital crime for Mass to be said in England. In 1768, at the trial of the Rev. James Webb, the Chief Justice pointed out to the jury that it was "high treason for any man who is proved to be a priest to breathe in this kingdom." The last trial on the charge of being a priest was that of the Hon. and Rev. James Talbot, in the following year; and a tender-hearted jury acquitted him "for want of evidence."

development among the Puritans, who fiercely attacked the "rags of Popery" which the Anglican Church had retained. They were particularly hostile to the wealth, dignity and proud titles of the Anglican Hierarchy. They contrasted the Evangelical poverty and simple style of the foreign Protestant ministers with the Babylonish rank and affluence of the English State Episcopate. It was chiefly, if not exclusively, against the Bishops that their attacks were at first directed, and their tenderness for the lower Order is a proof that it was not credited with sacerdotal powers. Had they suspected the Anglican Ministry of being a sacrificing Priesthood, a Bishop would not have been so very much worse than a priest. As it was, however, the Episcopate was their especial abhorrence. They asserted the essential equality of all "presbyters;" and they desired the introduction of the system of temporary officials, who should discharge such functions as the Anglican Bishops claimed to perform, either at the pleasure of their subordinates, as is common among Nonconformists in our own day, or else at the appointment of the State, as was then not unusual in "the Churches abroad."

It was against such adversaries as these that Bancroft, Bishop of London, and afterwards successor to Whitgift in the See of Canterbury, made in 1589 the first public assertion that "the Bishops of England have superiority over their brethren *jure divino* and directly from God."*

* "Neither Keble in the Preface to Hooker, nor the 'Catena Patrum' in the 'Tracts for the Times,' refers to anything earlier than this sermon of Bancroft's as teaching the Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church." Estcourt, p. 151. Whitgift, in his controversy with Travers, is sometimes thought to have distinguished between Anglican and other Protestant Orders. But there is no real evidence of his having regarded the distinction as important. Travers had gone abroad, and had been ordained at Antwerp "by the heads of the Congregation there." Returning to England, he was made Master of the Temple, and officiated there for some years until inhibited by Whitgift. But the Archbishop's hostility was not grounded on the

Hitherto Anglican Episcopal authority had been regarded as emanating from the State ; and it was only contended that such authority was "allowed in the Scriptures." The new teaching, however, made it to be in its origin divine ; and, though Bancroft did not assert that the Church of England had retained the Catholic Episcopal succession, nor maintain that such a succession was necessary to the Church's life (indeed he is known to have acknowledged the validity of Presbyterian Orders), yet these conclusions were logically involved in his doctrine of the "divine right" of the Anglican Bishops, and were distinctly maintained by the Jacobite High Churchmen who followed him. His statement, which was made in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross, alarmed and exasperated the Puritans, but does not appear to have been noticed by Catholics. It was, in fact, hardly definite enough to lead them to anticipate what further claims would be based upon it. When, however, the validity of Anglican Orders, as based on an unbroken Episcopal succession, was eventually maintained at the beginning of

invalidity of his Orders, so much as on his objectionable conduct and temper. He complained of his "intolerable stomach," of his "disorderliness in the manner of the Communion," of his "contempt of the prayers," and of his "negligence in reading," which resulted in his lectures being "so barren of matter that his hearers took no commodity thereby." And a book had appeared, said to be the work of Travers, in which, to the dismay of Whitgift, "the taking and paying of first-fruits and tenths" was condemned. His Orders he questioned, certainly, but with diffidence. He complained that he had left the order established at home, and had gone abroad to be admitted to the Ministry. He was "either in no degree of the Ministry at all, or else ordered beyond the seas, not according to the form in this Church of England used." See Walton's "*Life of Hooker*," pp. 30-34. Travers was Hooker's great-opponent, and against him and Cartwright the teaching of the "*Ecclesiastical Polity*" was mainly directed. Some of the charges he brought against Hooker are significant of the character of Anglicanism in the sixteenth century. He accused him of having taught that a Bishop or Cardinal of the Church of Rome, "yea, the Pope himself," notwithstanding their doctrine of merit, might yet be saved ; that he prayed before and not after his sermons ; that in his prayers he named Bishops ; and that he kneeled both when he prayed and when he received the Sacrament.

the seventeenth century, Catholics met the assertion with such a denial as their imperfect acquaintance with the history of the formation of Anglicanism enabled them to give, having up to that time consistently acted as if no such claim was to be looked for.

The year after Bancroft's sermon, Saravia's treatise on the "Threefold Order of the Ministry," appeared a work which had some little influence in its day. It will be noticed more fully in the next section, for it bears important testimony to the character of the original Anglican claim to the possession of valid Orders. Bilson's work soon followed ; and in 1597 was published Hooker's fifth Book, in which he asserts a doctrine concerning ordination, verbally at least the same as the Catholic, viz., that it confers an indelible character. On these writings was based the Jacobite High Church movement, the nature of which we must next proceed to notice ; and we shall find that the dignity of the Episcopate was what it had mainly in view. It had, therefore, little in common with the movement of our own day, which aims, it may be said exclusively, at the exaltation of the idea and functions of an Anglican priest, while it decries and derides its Bishops. The seventeenth century revival was grounded, certainly, on the alleged continuity of the Anglican Episcopal succession, and it was on that account that Catholics took part in the controversy, as will be noted later ; but there was no attempt made to prove that the Church of England had retained the Sacrament of Holy Order and a sacrificial Priesthood. Nearly another century had to elapse before these views would be tentatively asserted by the Nonjurors ; and two centuries and a half were yet to run out before an Anglican clergyman could be found who would gravely maintain that he was empowered to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

§ 42. *Anglican Orders in the Seventeenth Century.*

Saravia may, no doubt, be objected to as a witness to the nature of the Anglican Ministry, since he was a foreigner and not in Anglican Orders himself. But he was a convert to the Anglican Church, and therefore likely (one may well suppose), to make the most of such advantages as he had gained by the change. And he was, in fact, distinctly a High Churchman in those days, and the continuator of Hooker's reactionary teaching, whom he survived some thirteen years.* Although his treatise above mentioned was published before the close of the sixteenth century, its influence is to be found in the hierarchic movement which followed upon the accession of James. Episcopal government it most warmly defends, though there is nothing to suggest that the author was of opinion that its retention in England constituted a substantial difference between Anglican and foreign Protestant Orders. Indeed, had he thought so he would himself have sought Anglican ordination. He was, however, validly ordained according to the ideas then prevalent, for he had

* "There is a wide difference between the school of Whitgift and Hooker, and that of Bilson, Hall, and Laud. At first all that was contended for was that Episcopacy was permissible and not against the Scriptures, that it was a Church government ancient and allowable. This was contended by Jewell, Whitgift, Cooper, and others; but these divines did not venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the Sacraments. The first broaching of this doctrine in England [*i.e.*, in the Anglican Church], is apparently due to Saravia, a Spanish divine from the Low Countries, who published a treatise on the Ministry about 1590. The learned Hooker, in spite of the attempts of his excellent editor [Keble] to saddle him with the doctrine by implication, cannot be shown to have asserted that Episcopacy was essential to a Church, or that without the Apostolical Succession there was no sacramental grace."—Perry's "History of the Church of England," vol. i. p. 19.

been "lawfully called," though not in England, "by men who had public authority given unto them in the Congregation" (Art. xxiii.); and his case therefore differed from that of Travers, whose offence was that, being an Englishman, he had purposely gone abroad to be ordained. Foreign Protestant ministers conforming to the Anglican Church were unhesitatingly recognised as validly ordained during the sixteenth century; and this fact, if fairly considered, will be admitted as weighty testimony to the essentially Protestant character of Anglican ordination.*

The tone of Saravia's book forbids us to believe that he had any idea of the Church of England possessing the *Sacerdotium* in the Catholic sense. A few extracts will make this clear. He regrets that Utrecht had not been so fortunate as England in having "a truly Christian Bishop and Evangelical Pastors to succeed to the Bishop appointed by the Roman Pontiff, and to the Sacrificers of the Mass" (p. 24). He complains that "the Roman Antichrist had so afflicted the Church with his Bishops and Archbishops as to bring odium on the very names;" and that, to remedy this, some (*i.e.*, the Lutherans) "had changed the names, *retaining the things*, and had created Superintendents instead of Bishops" (p. 45). This is as much as to say that Lutheran Superintendents, whom

* To give examples, Whittingham, Dean of Durham, was not in Anglican Orders, and when his *status* was questioned, it sufficed to show that he had been duly ordained by the Genevan Protestants, according to their form. In 1582 Grindal licensed John Morrison, who was in Scotch Presbyterian Orders, to preach and administer the Sacraments throughout the province of Canterbury. And Mr. Keble, in his Preface to Hooker (p. lxxvi), admits that "nearly up to the time when Hooker wrote numbers had been admitted to the Ministry of the Church of England with no better than Presbyterian ordination." An Act had been passed in 1571 which provided that any person professing to be "a priest or minister of God's holy Word and Sacraments by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering than the form set forth by Parliament," might become a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England by merely subscribing to the Articles.

High Churchmen now regard as mere laymen, are really Bishops in all save the name. In his first chapter he defines the Ministry of the Gospel in Lutheran language, which excludes the notion of the Priesthood being the ordinary channel of supernatural grace ; and finally he quotes with approval, and adopts as his own, the sentiments of "that most illustrious old man Jerome Zanchy, venerable alike for his piety and his rare erudition." It is noticeable that this worthy professed a rule of faith very similar to that of High Churchmen ; for he says, "My faith I rest first and absolutely on the Word of God ; next, and in a considerable degree, on the consent of the whole ancient Catholic Church, if it be not inconsistent with Scripture." And yet, in spite of this adhesion to "primitive Christianity," he allowed that the continental Protestant Churches had retained Episcopacy as really as the Church of England, the distinction being merely nominal. "I have also had occasion to notice those Churches, which, having embraced the Gospel, have yet their Bishops both in reality and in name. Nay, in the Churches of the Protestants themselves there are in reality Bishops and Archbishops, though the good old Greek names have been badly altered to the Latin titles of Superintendents and Superintendents-General. And where neither the Greek nor these Latin names are used, even there some are chiefs with almost absolute authority. Why should there then be a controversy about names ? If they agree in the thing, why dispute about the term ?" (p. 226).^{*} Other passages might be quoted, giving a similar estimate of the nature of Protestant Episcopacy.

Rightly to estimate the bearing of this language on the controversy before us, we must remember that it was put

^{*} The references are to the translation of Saravia's treatise, published at Oxford in 1840.

forth thirty years after Parker's consecration as a sort of High Church apology for Anglican Episcopacy; and we submit that such claims differed not merely in degree but in kind from those which we now dispute. It was an assertion of the dignity and authority of the Episcopate, as being by divine right empowered to govern the Presbyterate, against the teaching of the Puritans, who were met by an *argumentum ad hominem*, inasmuch as the foreign Protestants, to whose ecclesiastical régime they had appealed, were admitted to be in possession of the things, though they disliked and refused the names, which the Church of England had retained.

Hierarchical principles having been thus vindicated by Hooker and Saravia, and the continuity of the Anglican succession (on which the "divine right" was now admitted to depend), having been demonstrated to his own satisfaction by Mason, the High Church theory of Anglicanism gathered strength with time, and thirty years later found its most earnest and practical advocate in Laud; who, nevertheless, as has already been noted, made the same admission as to the merely nominal distinction between Anglican Bishops and Lutheran Superintendents. Temporarily suppressed by the Rebellion, the theory reappeared at the Restoration with renewed vigour, and in a more exclusive form; for since 1662 Episcopal ordination has been insisted on as a *sine quâ non* condition to the right to officiate in Anglican churches, words to that effect being now for the first time inserted in the Preface to the Anglican Ordinal; and thenceforward "the Apostolical Succession" has been an ordinary official Anglican doctrine; though a denial of it has always been tolerated, and though it has never succeeded in obtaining acceptance as a popular tradition.*

* An article in the "Quarterly Review" for October, 1878, entitled "Is the

It is, however, undeniable that many of the seventeenth century Anglican divines used language in regard to the Church, the Priesthood, and the Sacraments, far more Catholic in tone than the expressions we have quoted from Saravia and others. It will be well, therefore, before noticing the objections to the validity of Anglican Orders which were raised by Catholics so soon as the claim was definitely made, to pass a general criticism on the relevance of the appeal to the "Anglo-Catholicism" of the age of the Stuarts, which gave such plausibility to Tractarian teaching ; though this appeal is made less confidently now by Ritualists, who are conscious that seventeenth century Anglicanism is not really in harmony with their own views ; nor, indeed, is it now any longer necessary, since Tractarian principles have established themselves as those of the modern Anglican Church.

It is pertinent to observe that, though Hooker and Saravia were less distinctly Protestant than their predecessors and contemporaries, yet Laud and his school went beyond them both in doctrine and practice. Again, the High Churchmen of the Restoration, of whom Bramhall may be taken as a type, were distinctly more advanced than the party of Laud. But the Nonjurors, in turn, went further than any Anglicans who had preceded them ; and the Tractarians (after a long relapse) put forth principles more orthodox than those of the Nonjurors ; while, finally, the modern Ritualists speak with contempt of the

Church of England Protestant?" pointed out that the exclusion of ministers not Episcopally ordained from inter-communion with the Church of England has not been so absolute since the Restoration as is commonly supposed. French Protestant ministers officiated in the Channel Islands, up to the year 1820, under the licence of the Bishops of Winchester ; and there is evidence that the addition to the Preface to the Ordinal was never intended as a condemnation of foreign Protestant Orders, but was merely designed to exclude the English Presbyterians from further participation in the privileges and endowments of the Anglican Church.

Tractarians for "not having gone far enough ;" though they themselves, meanwhile, are justly condemned by Catholics for not teaching (on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, for example) the full and perfect doctrine. And, seeing that beyond all question the Catholic Church in the sixteenth century taught concerning the Sacraments, the Priesthood and the Sacrifice, precisely the same truths that she teaches now in the nineteenth, it is clear that, if after all these successive steps her level has not yet been reached, the lapse from her doctrine at the time of the Reformation must have been serious indeed. And it has been to the evidence of this lapse, as it was manifested in the sixteenth century by the practice of the Anglican clergy, that we have appealed in vindication of our assertion that the Orders of the Elizabethan period (and therefore, of course, those of later times as well), differed substantially from those of the Catholic Church, though nominally they remained the same.

This consideration may aid us in estimating the true theological position of the Anglo-Catholic divines, which was really some steps below that of the modern Ritualists ; though, nevertheless, they were not by any means ignorant of Catholic doctrine, and used continually orthodox language borrowed from Catholic writers, and even from the Doctors of the Schools. They were profuse in their quotations from the Fathers, and strong in their professions of adhesion to the "primitive doctrine of the undivided Church ;" and yet, meanwhile, they were Protestant in their practice to an extent that would shock even moderate High Churchmen of our own day ; and, if ever they ventured on a definition of their faith in their own words, it smacked of Geneva rather than of Rome. Hooker may be adduced as an example. As we have already noted, he was distinctly heretical, even from the High Church

point of view, on the doctrine of the Real Presence, on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and on the nature of Absolution. No adherent of the modern advanced school would venture to assert that Hooker's religion was the religion of the Fathers of (say) the fifth century ; yet he quotes them again and again, as if they were the founders of the Anglican Church ; and he even adopts the language of Scholastic theologians, to the effect that Christian ministers have power over Christ's mystical body, and over his natural body ; but the meaning of the words evaporates into nothing as they flow from his pen.* His assertion (to give another instance) of the indelibility of Holy Orders, though expressed in Catholic terms, and regarded by High Churchmen as a most important statement in favour of their claim, seems when examined to come merely to this, that ministers are to regard their office as permanent, in contradistinction to the Puritan system of temporary officials. He cannot really have used the word "character" in its Catholic sense, for he did not regard ordination as a Sacrament.

What, then, are we to make of this inconsistency ? What are we to say of men who used Catholic words, Catholic phrases, and Catholic arguments, who appealed to Catholic writers, especially to those of early times ; and who yet implicitly, if not explicitly, denied what from Catholic lips or pens would be involved in the terms employed ? The explanation seems to be this :—Those with whom we are now concerned know what was meant by the Puritan "cant." Sincere enough it may have been in its origin ; but still High Churchmen are at one with Catholics in condemning its pious phrases as hollow, and its use of Scripture as unreal ; while they are still more decided in

* "Ecclesiastical Polity," Book V., cap. lxxvii.

denouncing the shibboleths of modern Puritanism, such as "justification by faith only," "self-righteousness," "spiritual worship," "formality and superstition." Yet it must not be forgotten that the men whose lips seldom opened, save to give vent to language interlarded with Biblical cant, were profoundly persuaded that they alone were in possession of Scriptural religion ; though High Churchmen will protest that what the Puritans regarded as the pure doctrine of the Word of God was nothing of the kind, but a mere Protestant gloss on certain favourite texts ; while all the language of Scripture which they could not reconcile with their professedly Evangelical views, they either ignored or explained away. And it must also be remembered that the phraseology of the Puritans was not their own invention. They received it with reverence from the foreign Reformers at Frankfort, Zurich, or Geneva, and they have transmitted it to the Low Churchmen of our own day.

But it may be asked, "Was there not also in the seventeenth, and does there not still exist in the nineteenth century, a High Church as well as a Low Church cant ?" Are there not the shibboleths of "antiquity," "primitive tradition," "the undivided Church," "pure Catholicity," and the like ? Is not the language of the Fathers, or rather scraps and cuttings from their language, employed by the High Church teachers in the same way as the favourite texts are by the Puritan divines ? Do not certain stock phrases from Catholic theology, which recur in the pages of the "Anglo-Catholic Library," correspond to the pietistic expressions of the Evangelical School ? Certainly this seems to be the only explanation of the Catholic terminology employed by the Jacobite High Churchmen ; though there is no need to suppose that there was any conscious dishonesty in the men who thus

wrote. They had accepted a theory about their Church which made it necessary for them to decorate the dry Branch, which the Reformation had bequeathed to them, with such leaves from the living Vine as suited their fancy. Ritualists agree with us in regarding as vain the appeals made to Scripture by the Puritans, whose knowledge of its letter was nevertheless profound; why should not Catholics be right in affirming that Hooker and his successors went no less astray, when they persuaded themselves that they had unearthed, and as members of the Church of England could practise, the primitive religion of the Fathers?

Unreal words have from the first been characteristic of Protestantism; and so they will remain to the end. Read through High Church spectacles, there are, no doubt, in the writings of the Jacobite divines passages which seem to testify to the "Catholicity of the Anglican Church;" but their practice and their explicit statements in other places manifest the hollowness of their use of Catholic phraseology. And when Bethel or Oxford in the present day reproduce the language of Zurich in the sixteenth, or of Lambeth in the seventeenth century, Catholics are as little in danger of being deceived by the one as by the other; even though in the latter case the factitious aid of ritual be invoked to support the claim.

§ 43. *Sketch of the Controversy as Conducted by Catholics.*

A brief sketch of the history of the controversy concerning the validity of Anglican Orders since Catholics began to take a formal part in it, is necessary to complete this part of our subject. It has already been observed that during the reign of Elizabeth the controversy can hardly be said to have been begun. The legal *status* of the Queen's Bishops was the only thing about them that was "questionable ;" and this was challenged rather as a taunt, than with any serious aim ; and when the "divine right" of the Anglican Bishops was first asserted, there was really no need for Catholics to protest against the claim, for in the form in which it was made it did not encroach upon the province of the Catholic Priesthood, but was put forth as an argument against the Puritan Nonconformists.

Nevertheless, the claim could only be sustained on the ground that the Anglican Hierarchy descended in unbroken succession from the old Catholic Bishops ; and, if it was good for anything at all, it logically involved the conclusion that the Anglican clergy were sacrificers of the Mass, and priests in the Catholic sense. And, though no one seems to have remarked this consequence at the time, it did not escape the notice of certain Catholics at the beginning of the seventeenth century that the Anglican Church was practically taking up a new position ; and it was thought advisable that the claim should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. In regard to their action in the matter, what we contend for is this, that they did not enter upon the controversy as calling in question for the first time a position which had hitherto been

tacitly allowed. Taking the practice of the Church as their guide, they found already in existence what in the year 1600 might be called a tradition of the nullity of Anglican Orders ; and, observing that the pretensions of the nascent High Church school ran counter to this tradition, they had in view its defence, and were not actuated, as all Anglican writers seem to assume, by mere controversial jealousy. Unfortunately, however, for the success of their attack, the four earliest impugnors of Anglican Orders, whose tracts were printed abroad between the years 1603 and 1614—Catholics being, of course, unable at that time to publish anything in England—based their objections mainly on the story of the Nag's Head consecration, which is now admitted to be really irrelevant to the controversy ; though it may still be maintained that, when all the circumstances of the times are fairly taken into account, its ascription of a somewhat contemptible origin to the Anglican Hierarchy might well have appeared to be the true account ; and certainly there are no grounds for asserting that it was a deliberate invention put forth by men who knew the real state of the case. Whatever may have been the origin of the story, this much at least is certain, that its publication by Catholics has done more than any Anglican arguments to weaken the Catholic attack, for it has left an impression that from the first that attack has been unfair, and took for its substantial basis a story which on further investigation has been found to have no argumentative weight at all. But, if we be not mistaken, the true account of the matter is, that Catholics had necessarily rejected Anglican Orders on theological grounds before the accession of Elizabeth ; and that the Nag's Head story was put forth by men who thoroughly believed in it themselves, and who saw in it a far more ready and effective argument than technical questions of matter

and form, which the people would not readily understand, and of which their Anglican opponents would make but little account.

Ten years elapsed between Kellison's "Survey of the New Religion," printed at Douai in 1603, the first publication of the Nag's Head story, and Mason's reply, which appeared with the highest official sanction, and gave the Lambeth Register of Parker's consecration, together with a somewhat superficial refutation of the theological objections which the Catholic writers had too carelessly raised. His book, however, necessarily indicated another vulnerable point, the questionableness of Barlow's Episcopal character, of which up to this time Catholics seem to have been wholly in ignorance. Dr. Champney, who wrote in 1616, called attention to this point; but he had, of course, no means of ascertaining the severity of the wound he was inflicting; nor, indeed, has it been duly appreciated until recent years. A new edition of Mason's work appeared after his death in 1625, in which, by way of replying to Dr. Champney, he gave an unfair account of Barlow's grant of temporalities, which was made to pass as certain proof of his consecration; and here the matter rested for a while.

During a part at least of the reign of Charles I., the Queen being a Catholic, and the Anglican prelates being as a body more High Church in their views than ever before or since, there was some prospect of a *rapprochement* between England and the Holy See; though there was really less likelihood of a corporate return to unity than there had been in Elizabeth's reign; for then only the Government and the Hierarchy had been Protestant, while the clergy and the people were still for the most part Catholic in sympathy; whereas in Charles' day, under a High Church prelacy, the nation had lapsed far into Puritanism. Never-

theless, Pope Urban VIII. sent Father Leander, a learned Benedictine, to enquire into the state of religion in England ; and some Anglican writers have argued from the guarded language of his report that he favoured the validity of Anglican Orders ; but the truth is that, though studiously careful to say nothing that might wound the sensibilities of the High Church party, who at that time seemed to be feeling their way towards Rome, his explicit statements were quite on the other side. Thus, writing to the Pope in 1634 he said, "The Church of the Protestants in England retains the external appearance of the ecclesiastical Hierarchy. If we do not regard them as Bishops, because we believe to be wanting to them a true imposition of hands, a true character of ordination received from a lawful ordainer, they themselves nevertheless contend that they are true Bishops and truly ordained." So again, when he was asked by Sir Francis Windebank what was absolutely necessary for the making of a Bishop, he answered "not without fear and trembling," evidently because he felt he could not give a reply that would be satisfactory to his interrogator, that, among other things, "the Consecrator must be a true Bishop, and have intention to perform what Holy Church intendeth by this rite, and use the matter and form which is received in the Church ; otherwise he conferreth nothing valid. Both Consecrator and he that is to be consecrated must first have received the power of Priesthood, that is, of sacrificing the Sacrifice of the altar, and of absolving penitents from their sins." It is clear from these and other expressions that he uses, that he did not admit the validity of Anglican Orders. Certainly, he desired the corporate return of the Anglican Church to Catholic unity ; and this fact seems to have misled those writers who have claimed him as a witness on the Anglican side. Perhaps

they were not aware that the possession of valid Orders is not a *sine quâ non* condition of such reunion.

A similar mistake has been made in regard to another Catholic writer, Father Davenport, better known as Franciscus à Sancta Clara. He shared Father Leander's desire that the Church of England might be induced to submit to Rome *en masse*, and with this end in view he made his celebrated attempt to harmonise the Anglican Articles as far as possible with Catholic doctrine. He gave, therefore, the most favourable interpretation he could to the language of Article XXXVI. which speaks of ordination. But that he was very far from allowing the actual Orders of the Anglican Church is proved by his explicit statements contained in the "Enchiridion of Faith," which he published under an assumed name in 1655, nine years after the appearance of his book on the Articles. His matured judgment was as follows.* After comparing the case of Anglican ordinations with that of Arian baptisms, he thus concludes :—"Since they have changed the Church forms *de industriâ*,† to declare that they do not what the Church intends and have solemnly decreed against the power of sacrificing and consecrating, that is, in the sense of the old and present Catholic Church, of changing the elements of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ our Lord, as appears in the 28th and 31st Articles, it evidently concludes that they never did or could validly ordain priests, and consequently

* The whole passage, from which only a few sentences have here been transcribed, will be found in Canon Estcourt's "Anglican Ordinations," pp. 235-241.

† This expression is from St. Thomas :—"Ille qui corruptè profert verba sacramentalia, si hoc *ex industriâ* fecit, non videtur intendere facere quod facit Ecclesia ; et ita non videtur perfici Sacramentum." *Summa*, P. III. Q. 60, A. 7, ad. 3. The same idea has been expressed above, where the nullity of the Anglican form has been traced to the "public and official intention" with which the Anglican Ordinal was compiled, with the distinct purpose of establishing an Evangelical Ministry in place of the Catholic Priesthood.

Bishops ; having, as I say, expressed clearly the depravation of their intentions in order to the first and principal part of ordination, which consisteth in the power *super corpus Christi verum*, of sacrificing and consecrating His true body, by them professedly denied, and the Sacrifice declared a *pernicious imposture*." He goes on to admit that the later (the Jacobite) divines had been "easier" on the doctrine of the Sacrifice; but "even they who are most temperate unanimously deny *Sacerdotem offerre Christum*, which destroys the very life of our Christian Sacrifice. All which ingenuously considered, I do not find any real or possible title (which I would gladly do, as being indeed a great enemy to multiplication of unnecessary differences, as true Christian charity instructeth me), for their ordinations in the sense of the Universal Church." *

Franciscus à Sancta Clara seems to have been the first Catholic writer on Anglican ordinations to abandon the opinion of the Schoolmen on the essential matter and form of the Sacrament, which had hitherto been strictly adhered to. In this he was followed by Father Talbot, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, who wrote in 1657, and was answered by Bramhall the following year. The earlier impugnors of the High Church claim had made light of the imposition of hands, and had based their theological argument on the omission of the "tradition of the instru-

* This able writer, whose argument against the validity of Anglican Orders is substantially the same as that of Canon Estcourt, which has been followed in this Essay, really cuts at the root of the Ritualistic position; though, singularly enough, his "Exposition of the Articles" is also the only line of defence that can render that position tenable. This work was the precursor, though in no sense (as is sometimes erroneously supposed) the originator, of Tract XC.; and this again has rendered possible such unnatural interpretations of their language as Bishop Forbes has given. Apart from the toleration which the Anglican authorities now tacitly accord to these last, on Liberal grounds, it would be absolutely impossible for the adherents of the modern advanced school to make the necessary declaration of assent with any approach to honesty.

ments." There is, therefore, nothing wonderful in the fact that the Anglican position gained no little apparent strength in consequence of the rise, in the middle of the seventeenth century, of the historical school of Catholic theologians, of whom Morinus may be taken as a type. Their admissions seemed entirely to discredit the objections of the earlier writers ; whereas, in truth, though the Schoolmen may have been wrong in designating a certain act as the essential feature in the ordination, they were right enough in their principle, in which the later writers were also at one with them, that the main scope of Holy Orders, the offering of Sacrifice, must be witnessed to either directly or indirectly in the rite, if the ordination is to be allowed as valid. There can, however, be no doubt that this apparent change of front on the Catholic side strengthened the Anglican theological position, much as the questioning of the fact of Parker's consecration has done service to their historical argument ; while the controversial spirit of the times rendered impossible any fair consideration of the real unity and cogency of the Catholic attack.*

We have already referred to the discussion of the question in France in the early part of the eighteenth century. To estimate its importance aright we must not leave out of sight the *animus* of that attempted fraternisation with the Anglican Church, which was favoured by certain learned Gallican divines. High Churchmen write of the movement as if it had seriously in view the corpo-

* In this connection it may be noted that the Florentine decree does not make the form of the Priesthood lie in the precise words *Accipe potestatem*, &c., but demands that the form should be *talis*, i.e., that it should have the sacrificial office in view. It is extravagant to make this decree set aside the imposition of hands entirely, and insist on the "tradition of the instruments" as absolutely essential under all circumstances ; for at the Council itself, to the decrees of which the *Instructio ad Armenos* formed a kind of appendix, the validity of Greek Orders had been allowed.

rate reunion of the Church of England with the Roman Catholic Church ; and they not unnaturally conclude that, if such a consummation was not thought impossible in the days of Archbishop Wake, it must be far less impossible now. But, in truth, the Catholic Church had no part in these negotiations, and their spirit was not hers. Disloyalty to Rome was the motive power with the writers on the Gallican side ; and, if the correspondence had led to any practical result, it would have been only to form a small schismatical Gallican Church, served by some clever but querulous men, and united, it may be, with the Anglican Church, but separated meanwhile from the centre and source of unity. Courayer's defence of Anglican Orders was written in the interests of this party ; and with the disappearance of Gallicanism has disappeared also belief in the Anglican Priesthood among French theologians.* Moreover, they who value highly the learning and industry which Courayer devoted to his task, should not overlook the elaborate replies put forth by such distinguished theologians as Hardouin† and Le Quien,‡ nor the original *Mémoire* of Renaudot, which first provoked the discussion.§

Continuing our sketch of the history of the controversy, we observe that Dodd's "Church History of England," first published at Brussels in 1738, contained an important "Dissertation on the Validity of Protestant Ordinations,"

* Several later French ecclesiastical writers have studied the history and character of the Anglican Church ; and some, as for example Le Maistre, have valued highly its peculiar position, as calculated to form a stepping-stone from mere Protestantism back to the Church. But this is a very different thing from an admission of its being in any sense a part of the Church, or possessing valid Orders and Sacraments.

† "La defense des Ordinations Anglicanes réfutée." Paris, 1727.

‡ "Nullité des Ordinations Anglicanes." Paris, 1725.

§ Tournely's arguments on the same side have already been referred to, sup. p. 100.

which appears, nevertheless, to have attracted but little attention, whether from its having been printed abroad, or perhaps rather because there were but few Anglicans interested in the question at the time of its appearance. Since then the subject has been discussed by various writers ; but little fresh light has been thrown upon it until recent years. From the beginning of this century, however, Catholics have been pretty nearly as free, and latterly quite as free as other people to examine independently and at leisure the documentary evidence of the Anglican succession ; and, in consequence of this, the old objections against the fact of Parker's consecration have been abandoned, mainly through the influence of Dr. Lingard, the volume of whose learned " History of England " dealing with the Elizabethan period, was published in the year 1823. Some years later the contest was taken up in America, and Dr. Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis, defended the Catholic repudiation of Anglican Orders against the Protestant Bishop of Vermont.* Accepting the fact of Parker's consecration, the Archbishop was nevertheless careful to vindicate the honesty of the old believers in the Nag's Head story, and showed that a really serious case could be made out in its support.

The treatise last mentioned belongs, perhaps, less to the history of the controversy than to its present position ; but, before we proceed to discuss this point, a word or two must be said as to a further laxity of practice which was especially common in the Church of England during the eighteenth century, and until the rise of Tractarianism ; for it is a matter which certainly casts an additional haze of uncertainty over the Anglican claim.

* " The Validity of Anglican Orders Examined." Philadelphia, 1841.

§ 44. *The Question of Anglican Baptisms.*

Previous baptism is an essential condition for the reception of all other Sacraments, including, of course, Holy Order. An unbaptised person is absolutely incapable of becoming a priest or a Bishop. Now, the Anglican Church provides a perfectly valid rite for the administration of baptism ; nor is there any reason to suppose that for some considerable time after the Reformation there was any general laxity among English Protestants in regard to it ; and certainly the baptisms of modern High Churchmen are valid beyond all question. But it is impossible to speak with equal confidence of the administration of the Sacrament in the Church of England from (say) the year 1750, until Tractarian principles had influenced all parties within the Establishment, as they only recently have done. The prevalent laxity of practice was reported to Rome during the last century, and about a hundred years ago directions were issued from the Holy See (which still remain in force, though now an invalid Anglican baptism is probably a rare exception), to the effect that in all cases converts from Protestantism in England were to receive conditional baptism, unless there were evidence, not merely of the fact of the Protestant baptism, but also of the satisfactory character of the act, which can, of course, be but seldom obtained. In Catholic times, and under the sanction of lawful authority, baptism by affusion had, before the beginning of the sixteenth century, taken the place of the more ancient, universal, and Scriptural custom of immersion.* But in the Protestant Church of England

* St. Thomas Aquinas (died 1274) speaks of immersion as *communior usus* in his day.

affusion gradually gave way to simple aspersion (the Prayer-book rubric notwithstanding); and baptism by aspersion, when the water used is insufficient to flow, is not certainly valid. And there was frequently in the Hanoverian period graver carelessness than this. A few drops would be sprinkled on several children at once; the words would not be said while the water was used; and there would sometimes be a doubt whether any water had actually touched the child at all. Moreover, disbelief in the sacramental efficacy of baptism was common in the Church of England for fully a hundred years. It was a ceremony for "naming," and nothing more; enforced by law, and therefore on no account to be wholly omitted; but the popular confusions between baptism and christening and "half-baptism" show how widely misbelief, if not disbelief, had spread.* One need only recall the ordinary condition of the ancient fonts before the modern ecclesiastical art movement, the views and mode of doing duty usual among the Anglican clergy of not so many years ago, and one can readily suppose, or rather one cannot fail to fear, that when the squire's younger son (the future Archbishop of Canterbury), was brought to the church to be "named" some cold winter's afternoon, carefully enveloped from head to foot in all that the nurse's ingenuity could suggest, the poor child would really receive no valid baptism, even if he so much as felt the moist tips of the parson's fingers. And when

* High Churchmen have admitted the substantial justice of the doubts which Catholics have expressed about Anglican baptisms before the modern Church revival. Thus, Mr. Bennett, Vicar of Frome, writes as follows in the first volume of the "Church and the World": "Baptism as a Sacrament was well-nigh lost among the English people. Common basins were brought into the churches, while the fonts were made into flower-pots for the garden of the parsonage. It is very questionable whether water, *when used*, really did touch the person of the child meant to be baptised." And the same witness is borne by the mysterious authors of the "Pastoral of the O. C. R."

he came to "sit in the chair of St. Augustine," allowing for the moment the validity of the Anglican ordination rites, that the Bishop who "consecrated" him was a true Bishop, and that none of his Episcopal brethren were in like case with himself,—yet, if he were Archbishop of Canterbury for any length of time, and were to "consecrate," the future occupant of that See, he would effectually destroy the continuity of the Anglican succession, supposing it to have existed up to that time.*

We have deferred reference to this question of Anglican baptisms to a somewhat late period in our discussion, inasmuch as it belongs to the present position of the controversy rather than to its history, and has only of late years been propounded by grave authority as a matter deserving of serious consideration.† So long as Anglicans are persuaded that Catholics began to baptise con-

* The Archbishops to whom these remarks would chiefly apply, since the Anglican succession has passed through their hands, and they were born during the period of laxity in regard to baptism above referred to, are Drs. Herring, Cornwallis, Moore, Sutton, Howley, Drummond, Markham, Vernon-Harcourt, Musgrave, Thomson, Sumner, Longley, and Tait. It is doubtful whether any of these would have been received into the Church without conditional baptism, had they sought reconciliation with Rome. See the "Table of the Anglican Succession" at the end of the Appendix.

† "When I was in the Anglican Church I saw enough of the lax administration of baptism, even among High Churchmen, though they did not of course intend it, to fill me with great uneasiness. Of course there are definite persons whom one might point out, whose baptisms are sure to be valid. But my argument has nothing to do with present baptisms. Bishops were baptised not lately, but as children. The present Bishops were consecrated by other Bishops, they again by others. What I have seen in the Anglican Church makes it very difficult for me to deny that every now and then a Bishop was a Consecrator who had never been baptised. Some Bishops have been brought up in the North as Presbyterians, others as Dissenters, others as Low Churchmen, others have been baptised in the careless perfunctory way once so common; there is then much reason to believe that some Consecrators were not Bishops, for the simple reason that, formally speaking, they were not Christians."—"Essays Critical and Historical," vol. ii. p. iii. The rest of the substance of Cardinal Newman's argument will be found in the Appendix, Note XIII.

ditionally converts from their ranks through mere unreasoning hostility to the Anglican Church, they will make little of this objection. But, when they have apprehended how necessary a century ago was that practice, which, though now less necessary, is still retained, they will be prepared to admit the importance of the question; and they will acknowledge that, although there was no need to urge the objection in the earlier days of the controversy, and although it is a matter incapable of decisive proof, yet that it could not now be left out of account, if the Holy See should direct an investigation into the validity of Anglican Orders; and that therefore it should not be forgotten by those who are confident that nowhere else is there a flaw in the Anglican claim.

Clearly, the Catholic Church cannot unconditionally acknowledge Anglican Orders, if she does not unconditionally acknowledge Anglican baptisms; and this consideration has an important application to any anticipated recognition of Anglican Orders on the part of the Oriental Churches. What view of Anglican baptisms is taken by the Russo-Greeks the writer has been unable to ascertain; but it is certain that the Greek Church proper would regard them as absolutely invalid; for she admits only baptism by immersion, and rebaptises converts from the Latin Church. It is impossible, therefore, that she should regard Anglican Orders (adherence to her own principles being assumed), as otherwise than absolutely null.*

A word may be added on the alleged suicidal character of an argument, which, without producing direct proofs, throws doubt on a series of acts, the invalidity of any one of which involves such tremendous consequences. Our doctrine of the descent of the Episcopal succession in

* See in the Appendix, Note XIV. on "The Eastern Churches and Anglicanism."

single lines, and not coincidentally through the hands of the coöperators, makes it necessary for us to be sure of the baptism of each Consecrator from the Apostle's days to our own. And Catholics are secure in this matter without the need of documentary proof or of mechanical safeguards, for their faith in the divine protection of the Church assures them that to the end it will remain the fully-endowed channel of sacramental grace, such as its Founder designed and formed it.*

* It must be borne in mind that no one accuses the Catholic Church of having at any time neglected or disbelieved in her supernatural powers. Her fiercest adversaries only contend that in the "dark ages" her moral standard was low, and her intellectual light feeble; while part of their charge against her is that she made too much of her mysterious gifts. The superstition of which they accuse her was a bad thing, certainly, if it was as they say; but meanwhile it would have protected rather than have risked the valid transmission of sacramental grace.

§ 45. *The Present Position of the Controversy.*

It is hardly too much to say that the High Church movement of the last fifty years has so affected the nature of the Anglican claim to the possession of valid Orders, that it can no longer be satisfactorily discussed on the platform which sufficed for those who were the first to advance it. They were less logical and consistent, certainly, than those who now boldly assert that an Anglican clergyman is a Mass-priest ; but their shrinking from this extreme position made their task of self-defence no very difficult affair ; for they were always able to set aside as irrelevant, arguments which proved convincingly that the Anglican Ordinal made no pretence to consecrate men to a sacrificial office. We contend, then, that merely to reproduce the reasoning by which essentially Protestant theologians defended the validity of their Orders, is quite inadequate to support the modern extravagant claims. Reference to the "Scriptural" character of the Anglican Ordinal, comparison of its "simplicity" with a similar feature ascribed to ancient or Oriental rites, maintenance of very precarious views concerning intention and the independent effect of coöperation—all this must surely be acknowledged as a very weak defence, when put forth by men who know what the Catholic religion was in England in the reign of Henry VII., and what the Anglican religion was in the reign of Elizabeth, who act as if they sincerely believed that the former was divine truth and the latter human falsehood, and who call heaven and earth to witness against the unspeakable wickedness of perchance their own Bishops, should they modestly propose to omit a single obsolete or incomprehensible rubric from the Prayer-

book authorised by the first Parliament of Charles II. And yet this is pretty nearly all that is offered by those Anglican writers of modern times, on the cogency of whose arguments depends the affirmative answer to the question whether Ritualism be really anything more than theatrical display.

The treatise in which Dr. Lee defended the validity of Anglican Orders appeared some ten or twelve years ago, and was hailed with enthusiasm by the advanced High Church school, as placing beyond question the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry, and consequently the propriety of the new Ritualistic mode of worship.* There can be no question as to the support to this last which its publication gave. The number of Anglican churches in which the external ceremonial of the Mass is used, has been increased twenty-fold since 1867; and not a few of the clergy, to whom this state of things is due, base their belief in their sacerdotal character on a vague remembrance of some of Dr. Lee's arguments, which, on their first appearance, were thought by many to have ended the controversy in favour of the Anglican claim.

Yet the book was quite insufficient to carry the weight laid upon it. The conclusion that the author had in view was that the Anglican Ministry bears the same relation to the Catholic as the Priesthood of the Oriental Churches; in other words, that Anglican clergymen are sacrificers of the Mass. But, in support of this position, so far more advanced than that which had hitherto been claimed,

* "The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England Maintained" (London, Hayes, 1867). In a laudatory notice (one among many from the High Church press), the "Guardian" pointed out that "the drift of Dr. Lee's book and summary of its argument undoubtedly put the question on its right footing." This may be fully admitted. No Anglican writer before Dr. Lee had boldly claimed all that is involved in valid Orders. But our complaint would be that, after having adopted a Catholic platform, he was content to fall back on the merely Anglican arguments of his predecessors.

he produced no new evidence, either historical or theological; his comparison of the Anglican with ancient traditional rites showed that he had not grasped the fundamental distinction between the two cases, which really nullifies the parallel; and that part of his book which seemed to present a novel and important feature, viz., his allegation of Catholic authorities in favour of Anglican Orders, has been shown to be entirely untrustworthy, and since the publication of Canon Estcourt's criticisms must be regarded as thoroughly discredited. And with that strange unreality, so characteristic of Anglicanism, Dr. Lee solemnly dedicated his book to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, if the arguments which the book contains are correct, lives in habitual neglect of his most important work, the offering of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

The late Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, devoted a few pages of his "Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles" (pp. 700-726), to a defence of Anglican Orders; and, as he was well read in Catholic theology, and was, in principle at least, as advanced as the most extreme Ritualists, his arguments, which gain further weight from the fact that they were approved, if not in part suggested, by Dr. Pusey, deserve serious consideration. But his theological defence is certainly disappointing; he took more pains to maintain the reality of the Anglican Episcopal office than the sacrificial character of the Anglican Priesthood; nor did he urge anything on behalf of either which is not fully met (so the writer ventures to think) by what has been said above. He takes for granted that *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* must have meant the same thing with Protestants as with Catholics in the sixteenth century; and he is easily satisfied with a *minimum* of matter, form and intention; apparently not seeing that what may be described as a deliberate conjunction of these *minima*,

results in a case not contemplated by the theologians to whom he refers. That he was in error in supposing that Pope Julius III., through Cardinal Pole, recognised Edwardine Orders, and in concluding that the Council of Trent could see nothing amiss in Elizabethan Orders, save the lack of jurisdiction received from the Pope, has already been pointed out ; and it is difficult not to believe that a little more care bestowed upon the passage he had found in Le Plat might have saved him from becoming the originator of a legend, to which not a few High Churchmen still pertinaciously hold.

The late Mr. Haddan defended the Apostolical Succession of the Anglican Ministry with scholar-like accuracy.* He treated the historical side of the question with singular carefulness ; and the result was somewhat to the disadvantage of his own cause, so far at least as Barlow's consecration is concerned. His theological defence is from the Catholic standpoint not satisfactory, inasmuch as he does not appear to have had in view the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood. His position was that "in the Church there is a divinely-constituted Ministry, an Order of men to whom God has entrusted certain authority and powers, and who possess exclusively the commission of Christ both to teach and administer Sacraments, deriving their appointment from God Himself, through those who have received authority to transmit such a supernatural gift—that is, the grace of Orders." This statement, though good as far as it goes, falls short of the full truth, since it leaves out of sight the main scope of ordination, the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. This part, therefore, of Mr. Haddan's work is inadequate to maintain the position of those who assert that the functions of Catholic and Anglican priests are the same.

* "Apostolical Succession in the Church of England." London, 1869.

Mr. Bailey's work is monumental in size, but is otherwise less remarkable.* Its scope is to give the documentary evidence in an accessible form ; and, for the benefit of foreign ecclesiastics, it is published in Latin, as well as in English. It is to be regretted that the records are not in all cases printed in full. It may be that what is omitted has no direct bearing on the controversy ; still it is more satisfactory, when one wishes to examine the original language of the authorities commonly quoted, to find the whole presented without abbreviation ; and the character of Mr. Bailey's publication, as well as its size (for it is no mere essay or summary of the argument), would naturally have suggested, if it did not demand such a course.

So far as the theology of the controversy is concerned, Mr. Bailey is even less advanced than Mr. Haddan. He does not contend that valid Orders involve more than "a right administration of the Sacraments ;" nor does he appear to have contemplated a defence of sacerdotal doctrine. Indeed, his book is published with the special approval of the present Archbishop of Canterbury. And yet, with that strange inconsistency, which seems to be inseparable from a profession of High Church principles, Mr. Bailey announces himself on his title page as *Sacerdos*,—a perfectly gratuitous employment of the term ; for, even if he were a priest in the Catholic sense, *Presbyter* would be more correctly used in such a place. Should he persistently act as *Sacerdos*, as well as describe himself as such, his proceedings would not long enjoy his Archbishop's sanction.

There are numerous smaller works and pamphlets on the same side ; but as all their facts and arguments appear to be taken from one or other of the writers above

* "A Defence of Holy Orders in the Church of England." London, 1870.

mentioned, they need not be separately specified.* The modern doctrine as to the nature of the Anglican Priesthood, which is the basis of the Ritualistic movement, may be described as the necessary result of the High Church theory of Anglicanism ; and it is this doctrine which the writings of Mr. Bailey, Mr. Haddan, Dr. Lee, Dr. Littledale, and Dr. Forbes, are thought to have rendered incontrovertible.

But the treatise of Canon Estcourt, which appeared in 1873, can at least claim this advantage, that it is as yet the last word on the subject ; and a very powerful word it must be confessed to be. No one can read it without acknowledging its learning, candour and moderation ; and, as it has now remained unanswered for some five or six years, it would seem as if those whom it concerns, and who are able to appreciate its arguments, regard it as unanswerable.† Another explanation of their silence may be, that they no longer consider it important to gain Catholic assent to the justice of their claim. This, however, would indicate a very serious change for the worse in the theological attitude of the later school of High Churchmen ; and it may well be hoped that so narrow and insular a spirit does not widely prevail among the promoters of a religious revival, which, whatever may be its faults, is supported by many learned and devout men, and is certainly spreading far and wide a knowledge of important Catholic doctrines and practices. It is, then, perhaps safer to conclude that the absence of any formal reply to Canon Estcourt's work is due, not so much to

* Dr. Littledale's Tract, reprinted from the "Priest's Prayer-book," has been noticed above, p. 132.

† The article in the "Church Quarterly" referred to above, which professes to review Canon Estcourt's book, cannot be regarded as an answer, for it wholly ignores his main arguments.

indifference to the judgment of Catholics, as to a want of appreciation of the cogency of his arguments ; and it is part of the scope of the present Essay to call attention to the importance of his book. These pages may, in fact, be regarded as a kind of introduction to it ; for, so far as the history and theology of the controversy are concerned, they are little else than a summary of some parts of the treatise, while other parts have been expanded and illustrated. His line of argument has not been intentionally departed from in any particular ; save that less account has been made of the alleged parallel of the Abyssinian ordination ; and that on the ground that the more it is examined, the less substantial does it appear. As being the first to make it known, and with characteristically scrupulous anxiety to make every possible allowance to those whose position he was controverting, Canon Estcourt naturally laid stress on an official decision which admitted the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* as sufficient, under certain circumstances, to confer priestly ordination. But he has also pointed out that the decision does not include the sufficiency of the form under all circumstances, and that it is just the absence of the necessary conditions accompanying its use in the Anglican rite which renders it insufficient there. Clearly, then, his argument is wholly in accordance with what was stated in the formal reply to Cardinal Manning's interrogation received from Rome in 1875 ; and it is merely the prominence given to the Abyssinian decision in his work which has misled Anglicans. Studiously moderate in his language throughout, he sometimes hardly seems to do justice to the force of his own reasoning ; but that he is in the end victorious will not be easily denied, save by those who take up his book seeking a party triumph rather than the truth.

In drawing, then, to a close our consideration of the historical and theological evidence, we observe that the Catholic challenge to the upholder of the Ritualistic estimate of the nature of Anglican Orders may be thus summarized :—

Are you morally certain,

1. That Parker's consecration actually took place ?
2. That Barlow was a true Bishop ? or else,
3. That the assistant Bishops make good all defects in the Consecrator ?
4. That the Anglican rite for Episcopal Consecration used until 1662 sufficed to produce Bishops in the Catholic sense ?
5. That the Anglican rite for priestly ordination used until 1662 sufficed to produce priests in the Catholic sense ?*
6. That those Anglican Bishops through whom the succession is alleged to have descended were all of them baptised ?

Now, we have here six debateable points, the negation of any one of which (save that the negation of the second would be covered by the affirmation of the third, and *vice versa*) would be fatal to the High Church claim. Suppose that we grant the first, and do not press the last, as incapable of formal proof or disproof, and further concede, as of course we do, that the maintenance of the second *or* the third, and not of both of them, will suffice, we still have three serious questions before us, all of which must be answered in the affirmative, else the Ritualist's position is vitiated. Nor will it suffice if such an answer is only *probably* affirmative. Where a matter of such grave

* In answering these two questions there must be taken into consideration not merely the bare matter and form retained, but the apparent intention with which the rites were compiled, authorised and used, on which the sense of the form depends.

importance is concerned, a position is not tenable in practice unless it be "safe." And on that account the expression "morally certain" was used above.

To reply to this challenge, "We meet all your arguments, plausible as they undoubtedly are, with an act of faith in the Church of England," is a mere evasion of the difficulty. An act of faith is not applicable to a case like this, and it is an abuse of language thus to speak. An act of faith is an unconditional submission to an authority which claims to be and is accepted as an infallible teacher in what concerns the unseen world. Such an act enables us to know the truth of what is beyond but not opposed to reason and the experience of our senses. Now, the Church of England disclaims infallibility. Her teaching on the subject is throughout destructive. General Councils may err, and the most venerable Churches of Christendom actually have erred. Scripture alone is infallible; but even this cannot be infallibly interpreted. Strictly speaking, therefore, an act of faith in Anglican doctrine is impossible. And on the question before us there is really no Anglican doctrine at all. Certainly, the High Churchman makes what corresponds to an act of faith in the Catholic doctrine on the Sacrament of Holy Order. But how is he able to do this? Not because that doctrine is proposed to his faith by his Church, but because his peculiar view of the infallibility of "the undivided Church" enables him to make quasi-acts of faith in doctrines which by his private judgment he has ascertained the undivided Church to have held. And then, further, by his theory of the "Catholicity of the Anglican Church," he transfers this doctrine, which he has thus embraced, into the *credenda* of his own communion. But this, of course, is a still more definite act of private judgment, and reduces his act of faith, if ever it was such, to the level of a mere opinion.

Suppose, however, we grant him his faith in the doctrine, still he cannot make an act of faith in the facts. And, as was at the first pointed out, the question of Anglican Orders is distinctly a question of facts. Even a Catholic is not called upon to make an act of faith in the *fact* that this or that priest has been validly ordained, or in the *fact* that at this or that Mass the Host was duly consecrated. His faith is directed towards the doctrine of the Church on the Sacraments of Holy Order and of the Holy Eucharist ; and in practice this, of course, is sufficient. But, if noteworthy evidence were brought before him that a certain priest had never been really ordained, and so, whether consciously or not, was playing an assumed part, he would not allow such a question of fact to be slurred over by an act of faith in Catholic doctrine, or even in the Catholic Church. No doubt, the strictness of the Church's discipline renders such a case in the highest degree improbable ; still it is not impossible ; and there is to the point the well-known story of a young priest, who, while on his way to the altar to say his first Mass, was recognised by his old nurse, who stopped him and told him that in a fit of anger against his parents she had neglected the duty entrusted to her of taking him to be baptised. What did the priest do ? Did he " make an act of faith in the Church ? " No, he carefully investigated the facts ; and, finding the statement correct, was baptised, confirmed, and ordained *ab initio* ; and not until then did he attempt to say Mass. In short, such an " act of faith " as is sometimes recommended to Anglicans, who have for the first time become aware of the doubtfulness of their Orders, is really nothing of the kind, but is a culpable refusal to give a fair consideration to certain plain facts which have come before their notice, the significance of which they are called upon to ignore.

To those who would seek to evade the conclusion to which the evidence we have adduced unmistakeably points, by repudiating in the end the principles which were assumed at starting, there remains but little to say. That Anglican Orders may be valid enough *as Anglican Orders* is not the question we have had before us. It is their validity as Catholic Orders that has here been disputed. Those who are satisfied to maintain the former proposition only, can without difficulty reply to all that has been urged in this Essay; for there is nothing to hinder them from starting from principles of their own. If, for example, they maintain that in Anglican theology every Bishop who assists at a consecration is a true and independent Consecrator, historical difficulties will no longer perplex them. If they argue that ordination rites are valid, so long as they suffice to produce Bishops and priests in some special Anglican sense, they can easily prove their Orders beyond all possible cavil. But they must bear in mind that Orders thus and thus only defensible are not Catholic Orders. They who have received them must not on that account style themselves "Catholic priests;" and they must cease, until they get a better title, to profess to say Mass and absolve. They must henceforth be as loyally Anglican in their practice as they are in their principles. They must give up their chasubles and stoles, their cottas, Roman collars and birettas, their lighted candles and incense, their genuflexions and elevation of the Host, and whatever else they have of late years introduced into their churches, with the deliberate purpose of reducing to a *minimum* the difference between the Anglican Communion Service and the Catholic Mass. For all this must be confessed to be utterly unmeaning and misleading, if Anglican Orders are not valid in the Catholic sense.

Catholics may, no doubt, admit and admire the consistency and self-devotion with which the Ritualists have in practice illustrated their theory of the identity of the Anglican and Catholic Priesthoods. They may respect the firmness with which at least a few of them have withstood for conscience' sake the attacks made on what they believed to be their legitimate occupations. But they must still protest that in their judgment the theory itself is a mistake, and that the modern school have been deceived by the Elizabethan compromise, precisely as so many would-be Catholics were at her accession deceived. Take away the bare names of Bishop and priest, so astutely retained by the Anglican Reformers, but leave all else in the Anglican system the same, and Catholic-minded High Churchmen would needs become Roman Catholics ; if, indeed, without those names the Elizabethan fraud could ever have been imposed on the English nation at all.

IV.

CONCLUSION.

§ 46. *The Plausibility of the Anglican Claim.*

No man was ever yet persuaded that an opinion he had long held dear was wrong, by the force of a single syllogism, the premises of which, and the logical sequence of its conclusion, he nevertheless could not deny. A patient examination of his side-arguments, in which in his extremity he would take refuge, is needed before he will admit his error. But even then something further is commonly necessary. Not only must the evidence to which he has himself appealed be shown insufficient to bear his conclusion, but its plausibility must also be recognised, that he may see how it was that he came to fall into his mistake.

The collective force of the historical and theological objections against the validity of Anglican Orders is undeniably great. And this force is not a little augmented by a reference to the "urgency of visible facts" which we had before us at the first. Those clergymen whose Apostolic descent comes, if at all, through Barlow and Parker, have within a little demonstrated, by their ordinary tone, their uncertain faith, their mode of life, their estimate of their Eucharist, and their hostility to what is involved in the Catholic idea of the Priesthood, that they are not priests in the Catholic sense, but only in a sense which has relation to the Church and State of England. Worthy and

pious men, as many of them undoubtedly are, they are still Protestant ministers and not sacrificing priests. They have duly received from their own proper authorities their commission to discharge functions more or less ecclesiastical in character; but they have obtained through their Anglican ordination none of that sacred and mysterious character which the Sacrament of the Holy Order bestows. Such, we contend, is the corroboration of the historical and theological evidence, which is afforded by a fair consideration of the ordinary characteristics of the Anglican Ministry.

Nevertheless, in spite of the strength of the testimony against the Anglican claim, we still find it steadily and pertinaciously maintained; and it may therefore be well, before the subject is dropped, to estimate the value of some of those counter-considerations which, no doubt, invest that claim with some considerable plausibility, and which account for the success with which it holds its ground.

The wealth, dignity and social position of the Established Church at once raise it above the level of the Dissenting and foreign Protestant communities, and seem to silence as an impertinence arguments that would reduce its Bishops and clergy to the ecclesiastical *status* of other Protestant ministers. It possesses the ancient Catholic Universities, Cathedrals and parish churches, with the endowments that were mainly intended for the due celebration of the Mass. It retains the grand old historical titles, which imply that the Anglican Bishops of to-day are the true successors of saintly prelates, whose thrones have really been vacant these three hundred years. Its wealth attracts to its service the best of the learning, scholarship, and artistic skill which our own or other countries can produce. And it is at the present time

exceptionally earnest and active, nor by any means unsuccessful in such work as it undertakes. There is thus a kind of *prima facie* evidence to bear out the assertion that the Church of England is in possession of some power not shared by other Protestant bodies.

But there is really nothing in all this involving so much as a probability that the Anglican Church is served by a sacerdotal Ministry. Indeed, it is rather evidence the other way. Had the English Reformers transmitted into the National Establishment the Priesthood of divine institution, the hostility of the world would never have tolerated its retention of so much material wealth, which, so long as it is regarded as a mere human creation, and is content to rank as the servant of the State, it is allowed to enjoy. The bare assertion of the Ritualists that their Priesthood is such as the world hates, has already sufficed to charge the guns which the political enemies of the Establishment had brought into position; and before long that attack must begin, which sooner or later will result, not only in the disestablishment, but in the disendowment of the National Church. Not that such a temporal disaster will at once deprive the Anglican system of its most earnest and active supporters. The contrary effect will more probably be noticeable at first. But earnestness and activity are by themselves no evidence of the sacerdotal character of a Ministry. The age we live in has these characteristics; and they are shared by the Protestant, and even by the non-Christian communities, no less markedly, *mutatis mutandis*, than by the Anglican Church. And indeed, when the external bond of union which now holds Anglicans together has been removed by political changes, the very liveliness which the Church of England displays will tend to her destruction; for her want of dogmatic unity must result in disintegration, when men

become wearied, as earnest men do, of hollow and misleading compromises.*

The claim we have disputed gains some support from the quasi-Catholic language found here and there in the Prayer-book. The more important details of this language have already been considered, and have been shown insufficient to carry the weight put upon them. Our position in the matter is that certain Catholic words and phrases, in some cases acknowledged to have lost their Catholic meaning, were deliberately retained, with the view of securing the conformity of those who shrank from the bareness of the Puritan system, and were tolerated by the advanced Protestants, as capable of interpretation in their own sense. And it must also be remembered that the Prayer-book as now in use has twice been revised by High Churchmen, and so favours the "Anglo-Catholic" position considerably more than its predecessor in Elizabethan times. Yet it is the medium through which its language is studied, rather than the language itself, which gives apparent support to the doctrines of Ritualism. High Churchmen bring their principles to the Prayer-book, just as Protestants bring theirs to the Bible, and then they find them there. Anglicans who treat certain parts of their formularies as little else than inspired, and who insist on the exact force of the wording and punctuation, can hardly enter into the feelings of Catholics in regard to the Prayer-book as a whole, who remember that it was the product of times of apostasy, deceit, and violence ; that its compilers were, some of them, Bishops and priests who had violated the most solemn obligations by which men can be bound ; that its authority has never been anything more than that of an Act of Parliament, of which, in fact, it has

* See in the Appendix, Note XV., on "Anglican Internal Disunion."

been and is the schedule ; that, although as a literary work it has no doubt great merits,—its translations of the Psalter, and of the ancient prayers being masterpieces of bold and vigorous English,—yet hardly a page is not, at least by omissions, marked with heresy ; and that it is at best but a poor soiled fragment of the liturgical wealth of Catholic England, which had been the growth of centuries and the work of saints. Did they bear in mind these facts, it would not surprise them that Catholics decline to be persuaded that they have mistaken the true character of the Anglican system as a whole, merely on the strength of some stray Catholic word or phrase, which the lips or pens of the compilers of the book had refused to forget. The wonder is, not that such expressions should be found, but that so few remain.

The support afforded to the High Church theory of Anglicanism by the language of the seventeenth century “Anglo-Catholic” divines has already been referred to. There can be no doubt but that when they are read for the first time by men who, after having been educated in the old-fashioned Church of England system, have come under the influence of the Ritualistic movement, they do seem to give evidence in favour of this last. But their hollowness and inconsistency are at once detected by those who, through the grace of God, have learnt the true Catholic faith ; and, indeed, the more advanced of the modern High Churchmen readily allow that the most extreme men among their Jacobite predecessors belonged to a wholly distinct school of thought from themselves, and never contemplated the introduction of ceremonial observances, nor employed Catholic modes of expression, such as are now quite common with the adherents of Ritualism.

A specious defence of Anglican Orders is often made

by the assertion that the Catholic impugnors of their validity have betrayed the weakness of their cause by having in former years made use of unproved and untenable statements in questioning the historical continuity of the succession, and by having continually shifted their ground in raising theological objections.*

But, in regard to the first part of this charge, we have already pointed out that until fifty years ago Catholics laboured under very grave disadvantages in not having free access to the documentary evidence of the Anglican succession ; and, in regard to the second part, we willingly allow that there have been differences in the precise theological objections that Catholics have raised ; but we maintain, nevertheless, that there has been throughout a substantial unity about these objections, far greater than they who make this protest appear to realise. That the Church of England did not and does not ordain priests to the end that they may offer the Holy Sacrifice—this has always been the main contention of Catholics since the controversy first began ; and it is a proof of their honesty, surely, rather than of their craftiness, that they abandoned the technical objection founded on the Scholastic opinion concerning the essential feature in ordination, when the antiquarian school arose in the seventeenth century ; and that the latest impugnor of the Anglican Priesthood should have even gone further, and have unearthed a precise verbal parallel to that very form

* Thus, an article on the "Spiritual Claims of the Church of England" in the "Church Quarterly" for January, 1878, says, "The cavils against the validity of Anglican Orders cannot be regarded as other than consciously insincere, if only from the entirely different grounds of objection taken up by successive generations of controversialists." An imputation of conscious dishonesty is here lightly brought against Catholic theologians, whose judgment in this matter (as the writer ought to have known), no modest or prudent man would venture so contemptuously to reject.

which he condemns as insufficient. In truth, it is the Anglican claim rather than the Catholic argument that has varied so widely. What substantial unity can be traced between the assertion made in Elizabeth's day that the Anglican Hierarchy had been legally established, and the Jacobite claim that those Bishops were superior to presbyters by divine right, and had preserved a regular succession? and what unity, again, can be traced between this seventeenth century vindication of the dignity of the Anglican Episcopate, and the modern Ritualist's assertion in the teeth of his Bishop's protest, that he is ordained to say Mass and absolve? Indeed, it is due to this process of gradual evolution that the Anglican claim to possess valid Orders has avoided refutation long ago. With what possible chance of success could the modern doctrine have been maintained in 1580, when any day Dr. Littledale might have witnessed "visible facts" far more significant of the nullity of the Anglican Priesthood than the single occurrence which sufficed to persuade him that the Swedish Church has lost the Apostolical Succession?*

And, as to the further allegation, that the fair judgment of Catholics has been warped through their acceptance during so long a period of the Nag's Head story, now

* The present writer is disposed to hold that at the present day the most *effective* argument for Catholics to urge against all defenders of the Anglican Episcopal succession, would be the dependence of all Anglican Orders on Barlow, and the probability that he was never a Bishop. A fuller exposition of the objections urged in sections 38-41 above, would point distinctly to the conclusions, 1st, that the Consecrator alone truly consecrates; 2nd, that Barlow was Parker's Consecrator; 3rd, that he was probably only a titular Bishop; and 4th, that the earliest defenders of Elizabethan Anglicanism were conscious that their succession was not strictly Episcopal, but Presbyterian. But, if this argument were urged exclusively, the cry would be raised that "the ground has again been shifted;" and it would be concluded that the theological objections against Anglican Orders had been confessed incapable of being any longer sustained.

given up as irrelevant, it is pertinent to observe that the story appears to have been first put forth, not as being in itself an argument, but as accounting for the attitude of the Church in the matter, which had been practically decided by the ordination of clerical converts long before the story appeared in print ; and, indeed, had been determined before Elizabeth came to the throne ; and it must also be added that legendary evidence has not been adduced only on one side, for we have adverted to various untrustworthy Anglican stories, claiming Catholic acknowledgment of Anglican Orders ; and these stories, be it remembered, are mostly modern inventions, and are continually employed as arguments at this very day.*

Some Anglicans may have misunderstood the guarded language of Catholic writers, who, though their own views were clear on the subject, have been content to say that they thought Anglican Orders "very doubtful," but yet would be willing to accept their validity on the authority of the Holy See. Where opponents seem to allow that there is a reasonable doubt, they whose minds are made up on the other side may claim that doubt as a confirmation of their own opinion.

But, in truth, such reserved modes of expression are familiar among Catholics, and are perfectly well understood. They who use such language may still have a moral

* See above, pp. 128-138. The writer has no intention of asserting that Anglicans are dishonest in accepting and repeating these stories, though he does think that they have been too readily employed as evidence. The charge of dishonesty is very easily raised, and very hardly refuted, so long as either party thoroughly misconceives the other's position ; but, whether it be urged in political or religious controversy, it is commonly unjust. High Churchmen are often convinced that Catholics do not deal honestly with the question of Anglican Orders ; while, on the other hand, many Catholics suspect Ritualists of insincerity both in their professions and their practices. And yet, so far as the writer can judge, there has ordinarily been and is no more than *bonâ fide* error on either side.

certainly that their judgment is correct ; but they are guarded in expressing their opinion, because they are anxious not to anticipate a decision which in the end must belong to a higher tribunal than their own.

A considerable support to the sacerdotal theory of Anglican Orders is afforded, at least to individuals, by subjective evidence. A clergyman, who adopts High Church doctrines, becomes meanwhile conscious of his own aptitude for priestly functions. He finds it quite natural to wear a chasuble, to stand before an altar, to lift up the bread, to bless with the sign of the cross, to hear confessions and to give absolution. All such acts now seem to him in harmony with his own sense of his duties ; and he derives a sincere gratification from their performance. He concludes, therefore, that, whatever objections may be urged, he has found his proper work, and that to be any longer content with the *rôle* of an old-fashioned Church of England clergyman would be to neglect the highest functions entrusted to him.

But, in regard to this, it is enough to point out that he mistakes the consciousness of a sacerdotal vocation for the possession of a sacerdotal office. In a Catholic family there is commonly one at least among the children who displays the same natural aptitude for priestly work. At the age of ten he sets up his altar, says Mass, and gives Benediction with all the gravity of a venerable French *abbé*. Such acts are frequently a sign of a vocation to the ecclesiastical state ; but the ingenuous child has yet much to go through before he can attain to the reality of the sacerdotal office ; and these early indications of the bent of his mind may prove to have been only superficial.

The parallel is too obvious to need to be insisted on ; and, though Ritualistic clergymen may not accept it as complimentary, it is really the most charitable and the

most generous view that Catholics can take of their position. It implies that Almighty God has designated them, even while yet outside his Church, to act as his ministers and representatives on earth ; and that, with this end in view, he has dissolved the prejudices which once set them against the Catholic religion, and has infused into them a love and a desire for the office of a priest, giving them meanwhile an aptitude for its due discharge. More than this he could hardly have done without interfering with the freedom of their will ; and now, to coöperate or not with the grace vouchsafed to them, lies in their own power. To remain as they are is to prolong a childish game of Mass and Penance in the nursery, when the age of children has been passed. And only two other courses are open to them. They may give up their High Church principles, together with their sacerdotal pretensions, and lapse, as so many are doing, into the ever-varying position of theological Liberalism ; or they may remain loyal to the truth of that after which they had been feeling, and may embrace it, at whatever cost, where alone they have ascertained that the reality is to be found. And then, anyhow, whether their vocation to the ecclesiastical state be real or no, they will, as Catholic priests or as Catholic laymen, have secured that grace which was first offered them when they began to be conscious of the attractive power of even minor details of the Catholic religion.*

* It may not be out of place to add here a word with regard to the position in which clerical converts, conscious of a sacerdotal vocation, find themselves on their submission to the Catholic Church. Assuming as true the conclusion towards which this Essay points, it is clear that their Anglican ordination has not conferred upon them that character for which they looked. In short, it was in itself a nullity. But, supposing them to have been honestly mistaken in their estimate of Anglicanism, their own act, by which they sought to follow out their vocation, and to devote their lives to the Priesthood, was not a nullity ; it had the nature of a vow (such a vow, of course, as the Church can dispense from, and practically does so by her absolution of the

There is one more consideration, which (unless it be urged simply as a controversial expedient) is more than any other deserving of sympathetic and serious notice ; for it is subjective evidence of a very persuasive kind. There are those who sincerely maintain that they have

convert); and so, while they will confess they were deceived, and obtained a stone where they had looked for bread, their intended self-dedication to the Ministry contains in itself nothing which they need be ashamed of or repudiate. And, conformably with this (acting of course under the direction of the priest who receives them), they may well proceed, as soon as may be, to offer themselves as candidates for the genuine ecclesiastical state ; and certainly they are in no way bound to make a public disavowal of their Anglican Orders by an ostentatious profession of lay condition, whether in dress, manner, or pursuits. Indeed, such a course might risk the loss of their vocation, and might also prove a scandal to others, who are approaching the Church, but who can only see in such a transformation a lapse from a higher spiritual platform.

But, of course, these remarks apply only to the case of clerical converts who manifest distinct signs of a true vocation, and are free to follow it out. Many Anglican clergymen who obtain the grace of conversion have no kind of aptitude for the ecclesiastical state, and cannot be reasonably blamed if they adopt any profession consistent with their position as Catholic laymen. The critic in the "Church Quarterly," who has been referred to above, has evidently a very high standard of lay morality ; for he complains that "converts, so-called, ordained in the English Church, may be seen in the smoking-rooms of Continental hotels, or in ball-rooms at home, displaying their new-found Catholicism by an attire and conversation more laical than that of ordinary laymen." In what attire more "laical" than a "tourist's suit," or ordinary evening dress, these gentlemen can have appeared at such singularly innocent places of resort, one is at a loss to imagine. Nor is it easy to sympathise with this stern Cato when he frowns at "laical conversation." What would he have ? Are men who are certainly no longer Anglican clergymen, who sincerely believe themselves to be laymen, and who may never have had any drawing towards a real ecclesiastical life, to restrict themselves to the quasi-clerical dress customary in Protestant countries, and to the Ritualistic cant, of which they have perhaps already heard too much, out of deference to ill-founded prejudices from which the truth has set them free ? Yet his words really contain an unconscious homage to the Catholic Church. He would not feel moved to pass such implied censure on sprightly conversation and lay attire "in Continental smoking-rooms and ball-rooms at home" in the case of Broad Church clergymen, who may any day there be found. But he feels that a Catholic layman is bound to a higher standard than an Anglican priest ; and herein he is right. But he is wrong in concluding, on the strength of certain indifferent externals, that the men whom he condemns have not in that life which they live only in the sight of God made this precise change from a lower to a higher level.

consciously received grace through the Anglican ordinances. In regard to this, a caution is perhaps first of all necessary, for such an experience may be no more than a mere transient emotion, eminently untrustworthy in itself, and least of all to be relied on by those who confess they can adduce no better evidence in defence of the reality of Anglican Sacraments. It is, in fact, just the reason that Wesleyans give for preferring the chapel communions to those of the parish church, though they are condescending enough to partake of the latter as well. But we assume the assertion to be made in perfect honesty, by those who are not of a controversial turn, and who simply desire to obey the truth, the possession of which they think they have already secured. They have made confessions to and received absolution from Anglican clergymen, they have been regular communicants in Anglican churches, all in perfectly good faith, without even a momentary misgiving concerning the validity and regularity of the acts in which they were taking part, and they are convinced that through these means God has really touched their souls, and that the Anglican ordinances have been to them true channels of supernatural grace.

Now, Catholics have no difficulty in admitting the substantial truth of what is thus asserted, without at the same time conceding the validity of Anglican Sacraments in themselves. They are, in fact, bound to believe that God gives grace to those who are outside the Church ; and they know that he is not restricted to the ordinary channels he has appointed. Moreover, so far as baptism is concerned, the Prayer-book, if its rubrics are observed, provides a perfectly valid rite ; and the state of grace thus acquired is not forfeited save by mortal sin. Again, an act of perfect contrition, or such an act as, in view of what is within the reach of the penitent, might be elevated to that

rank, would obtain the remission of sins ordinarily granted in the Sacrament of Penance ; and an Anglican communion made in good faith might certainly secure the grace of a spiritual communion ; for the sincere desire of the recipient would not lose its reward. Catholics can thus make the fullest admissions as to the workings of God's grace beyond the limits of the body of the Church ; and that not merely among Anglicans, but among Dissenters and misbelievers of every kind ; so that the question of Orders is not necessarily involved at all.

But it must not be forgotten that these concessions depend wholly on the presumption of "good faith," an element which is not easily defined, nor can its existence be always safely recognised. Theologians speak of the indefinitely wide influence of "invincible ignorance ;" and the same idea is expanded in the expressions "involuntary ignorance" and "invincible prejudice,"—words which are intended to exclude the idea of culpability. But God alone can tell the limits of this ignorance ; for ourselves, we can but rarely say with full confidence of this or that non-Catholic that he is where he is in perfectly good faith. We may be tolerably sure that this is the case, we may be morally certain that he could not at this moment become a Catholic with a good conscience ; but we do not know what the past history of his soul has been, whether he have formerly rejected opportunities of knowing the truth, or whether at some future time such an opportunity may not present itself to him, and that simply through the working of God's grace, without any change in his external position, and apparently without any access of fresh intellectual light. One thing, however, is tolerably clear, and that is that good faith is for the most part an unconscious possession ; and that the man who seeks to reassure himself of the security of his position outside the Catholic

Church, by flattering himself that he is where he is in good faith, would by that very act go far to disprove what he would wish to maintain.*

It is important that this should be borne in mind ; for otherwise the concessions freely made by Catholics to those who are not of the true fold, and their scrupulous reticence in not attempting to shake the imperfect faith of men, whom they fear they could not even then induce to accept the whole truth, will be misunderstood, and the salvation endangered of those who are tending towards the conviction that they are bound to submit to Rome, or at least to make a serious enquiry into the justice of the Roman claims.

We contend, then, that these counter-considerations, one or other of which is often put forward as neutralizing the force of the arguments against the validity of Anglican Orders, cannot, when fairly examined, be accounted sufficient for such a purpose. What really constitutes the strength of the Anglican position, must be considered in a separate section.

* The cogency of subjective evidence in favour of the Anglican position is fully treated in "Difficulties of Anglicans," vol. i. pp. 65-84.

§ 47. *Prejudice the Main-stay of the Anglican Claim.*

There is, of course, nothing worthy of blame in the fact that the great majority of believers in Anglican Orders rest their faith in them on the authority of others. Some are persuaded simply by the vehemence and pertinacity with which the claim is urged.* Others yield assent because they feel it would be unbecoming in them to doubt the word of men, who, they must admit, are their superiors in intelligence and learning, and from whom they have undoubtedly obtained fuller and truer views of the nature of the Christian religion. Such a position as this is deserving of respect; and it has a certain correspondence with the Catholic principle of authority as the basis of faith.

But the distinction between the two cases becomes clear on examination. Faith in an infallible teacher, to which all are bound to submit, is intelligible enough. But the Anglican Church disclaims such an attitude towards her children, and so practically invites them to prove the truth of what she teaches, before they themselves accept it. Much more, therefore, are they justified in testing what is

* As examples of this boldness, which is surely a little misplaced in the assertion of a claim that has been and is so widely and so deliberately rejected, we may note that Mr. Bailey quotes Bramhall's confident statement, "If there be any Holy Orders upon earth, the Church of England hath Holy Orders," and language equally strong employed by Dr Pusey; while Dr. Forbes writes, "It is absolutely certain that Anglican Orders are valid and regular, unless the Pope's recognition is essential;" and the writer in the "Church Quarterly" ventures to affirm that "no genuine doubt can be felt about our Orders by any one who examines the evidence." Do not these apologists "protest too much?" Their positiveness betrays a weak cause; and a little more modesty would better become the upholders of a position that has been so long and so learnedly controverted, and is, moreover, so very generally regarded as untenable both by Catholics and Protestants.

no doctrine of her's, but is only asserted to be such by a small minority of her adherents—we are speaking, it must be remembered, of that estimate of Anglican Orders which makes Anglican clergymen to be sacrificing priests, —in spite of the protest of the very men on whom the succession depends. Within the Catholic Church the whole traditional system everywhere accepted bears witness to the character and regularity of the Catholic Ministry; but with Anglicans it is not so. Anglican traditions and consent give no real support to the modern High Church claim; it is, therefore, incumbent on those who maintain it to prove beyond reasonable cavil every step of their argument. And it is this, we contend, that has not yet been done. No doubt, a fair number of good and learned men are persuaded that the claim is just; but good and learned men have before now been deceived; and, so far as we can judge, only a very few out of this small minority have looked into the matter for themselves, have made the Anglican estimate of the Ministry, and the history of the Anglican succession, the subjects of independent research, and have fairly weighed the objections that are brought against their claim. And, moreover, is it not true that the few who have seriously examined the question—their names have been given above—have necessarily gone to work seeking vindication and victory rather than the truth; and that thus the number of voices that now so loudly assert the claim, are but the echo of the opinion of three or four partisans, who felt that everything depended on their being able to maintain their ground on this point?

We fully allow that Anglican Orders are more defensible than the Orders of any other Protestant Church; we concede that there is sufficient testimony in favour of their validity to make belief in them possible without absurdity;

and from this we conclude that so long as there is a prejudice on their side, and there are men who wish to believe in them, believers there will be. But, let the day come when this prepossession shall have ceased to exist, and there will not be found any one able to repress a smile when he hears the bold assertion made that the Anglican Communion Service is in reality the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. And, meanwhile, Catholics may well be content to refrain from any harsh condemnation of the Ritualistic priest; for his persuasion, although erroneous, goes far to secure his honesty, and contributes not a little to the success of a movement, which must eventually be to the advantage of the Catholic Church.

However near, then, to demonstration may seem to come the Catholic disproof of Anglican Orders, when judged by Catholic principles, there is reason to think that, in consequence of the existing strength of the prejudice in favour of the Anglican position, the termination of the controversy cannot reasonably be looked for at an early date. The truth is that the two points of view are really widely divergent, in spite of the similarity of language used by either party. And there is no reason to deny that the Catholic point of view constitutes a distinct though reasonable prejudice against the Anglican claim. The Catholic is firm in his faith in the unity of the Church. To him she would cease to exist if she ceased to be essentially One. He is jealous, therefore, of anything that might tend to mar that unity; and he is further jealous of the conservation by the Church of her endowment of grace, and is slow to believe that her supernatural gifts would be easily allowed to slip out, as through some crevice in the building, so as to fall into the hands of those who would despise or dishonour them. He does not, of course, deny that heretics and schismatics may be separated from

the Church, carrying with them the Orders, but not the jurisdiction, they have received from her ; but it seems to him wholly unlikely that they would retain her powers, if they had distinctly the will not to do so ; and therefore, while on the one hand he is disposed to maintain that within the unity of the Church some rare accidental omission would not be suffered to vitiate the continuity of the ministerial succession, on the other hand he suspects that in such a case as Parker's consecration, over and above the historical difficulty, and the technical questions of sufficient matter and form, the sacrilegious intention and the heretical will, on the part of administrator or recipient, or both, would *per se* constitute an *obex* sufficient to frustrate the validity of the act. In saying this we do not, of course, mean that a Catholic theologian would be content to reject the validity of Anglican Orders on such *à priori* grounds alone ;—the careful treatment given to the details of the controversy by Canon Estcourt and others at once disposes of such a notion ; it is merely to the fact that, from the Catholic point of view the Anglican claim must necessarily have a suspicious look, that attention is called.

Admitting, then, that there is a Catholic prejudice against the validity of Anglican Orders, we observe that it has its counterpart on the other side. An Anglican, who is loyal to his own communion, has a serious belief in its providential mission as a portion of that mysterious and indefinite institution which he designates "the Church at large." If he dislikes the term "Anglican," he falls back on "English," and speaks of "English Orders," and even of "English theology," by way of giving a flavour of patriotism to his ecclesiastical position, and with the view of casting a slur on the "foreign Orders" of the English Catholic Bishops, and the "Italian theology" of the

Catholic Church. He is under the impression that Dr. Tait's Orders come down in direct succession from St. Augustine of Canterbury, and so belong to a peculiarly English brand, while those of Cardinal Manning are exotic.* He holds that Anglicanism is "the English form of Catholicity;" and, in view of the exceptionally important position of the English-speaking races, all the world over, he concludes that this primitive and pure religion, which none but English-speaking people profess, is destined to exercise a beneficial influence over all other forms of Christianity.

But this is making too much of the significance of Anglicanism. As a stepping-stone from Puritanism back to the Church, it holds, no doubt, a position of considerable importance, which Catholics have without hesitation recognised. But in England itself it is now the religion of only half the population, while in Scotland, Ireland, America and the Colonies it is professed by only small minorities, and cannot ever become dominant; if only for the reason that it does not itself propose Christianity in any definite form, but consists of an accidental union of three distinct types, Puritanism, Rationalism, and Ritualism, with endless gradations between. Under these circumstances, the special principles and creed of the believer in Anglican Orders can hardly claim any grave significance when Christendom is surveyed as a whole. They may and do facilitate a movement from mere Protestantism

* Dr. Bright has pointed out ("Early English Church History," p. 221) that the actual Orders of St. Augustine were superseded, when, in 668, Pope Vitalian consecrated and sent Theodore of Tarsus to rule the English Church as Archbishop. But he is wrong in concluding that this second "stock" was that from which the Anglican Church is supposed to have drawn. The Orders of all the English Bishops at the time of the accession of Henry VIII. centred in Archbishop Warham (1502), whose Episcopal descent is traced to the consecration of Archbishop Stratford by Cardinal Vitalis, an Italian, at Avignon, in 1323. See Pye's "Identity of the Church of England," p. 131. Cardinal Manning's consecrator was an Englishman.

towards the Catholic Church ; but they have no permanence in themselves ; and cannot be expected to influence either East or West in the direction that an Anglican would desire.*

And, although modern High Churchmen are all professedly reunionists, there are not a few among the Liberal school who have no great confidence in an united Church, and no real desire to see Christendom once more one fold. They hold that the divinely-ordered unity of the ancient Church did not in fact prove a sufficient safeguard for her fidelity to the sacred deposit of truth ; and that even in "the undivided Church" errors and corruptions in doctrine, discipline, and worship, established themselves so firmly as to render her division inevitable. And hence they are bound to conclude that, since unity involves centralisation, its tendency must be rather for evil than for good ; for it facilitates the exercise of the universal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, and so disfigures that ideal which these theologians take to be divine, though it is really only their own. Thus minded, they are further disposed to hold that the formation of separate communities, such as the Anglican Church, is part of the providential method for preserving to the Catholic religion its primitive purity, inasmuch as the existence of such bodies acts, or should act, as a check on the deplorable impetuosity of "the Latin Communion."

* "You are a body of yesterday ; you are a drop in the ocean of professing Christians ; yet you would give the law to priest and prophet. . . . You have a mission to teach the National Church, which is to teach the British Empire, which is to teach the world ; you are more learned than Greece ; you are purer than Rome ; you know more than St. Bernard ; you judge how far St. Thomas was right, and where he is to be read with caution, or held up to blame. You can bring to light juster views of grace, or of penance, or of invocation of saints, than St. Gregory or St. Augustine ; . . . this is what you can do ; yes, and when you have done all, to what have you attained ? To do just what heretics have done before you, and, as doing, have incurred the anathema of Holy Church."—"Difficulties of Anglicans," vol. i. p. 139.

It is clear that a man who has been influenced by such notions as these (which, it is hardly necessary to say, are irreconcilable with the faith of Catholics in the Church, and make schism meritorious instead of a deadly sin), starts with a prejudice in favour of the legitimacy of the Anglican position, and so places the most favourable construction upon those events which resulted in the formation of his Church, anyhow as a separate community. Nor can he avoid being stimulated in his anxiety to defend those events by a motive of self-preservation; for his occupation would be gone (at least for a time, and could only be restored to him after his submission to a process which he might find tedious and trying), unless he could see his way to reject the Catholic estimate of his Apostolic descent.

If the proceedings by which the Anglican Hierarchy was established on Elizabeth's accession, could be relegated to the ecclesiastical history of some obscure corner of Asia Minor in the fourth century, and had resulted in the formation of a sect which died out before the eighth,—is it not certain that a High Churchman would have read with sympathetic enthusiasm of the dignified and uncompromising attitude of the Catholic Church in refusing to afford the slightest recognition to the Orders of the heretical and schismatical community? But the case is necessarily changed when the question touches his own life, when he finds he is himself on trial, and is not, as he would wish to be, the sole judge.

So, again, in our own day, is it not certain that a Ritualist would severely condemn any tampering with the existing Anglican Ordinal far less serious than the "tampering" (if so mild a word can be used to describe what was done) with the Catholic Pontifical in the sixteenth century? Would he, for example, acknowledge as valid

Orders conferred without the form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*?* This point is deserving of further illustration.

We will suppose the Church of England to have been disestablished, and to have broken up (as all appear to admit that it will) into two or three fragments. The Bishops faithful to Protestantism devise an Ordinal which shall finally exclude all possibility of a return to the errors of sacerdotalism. They agree, however, to retain the title "priest," as being in itself free from superstitious significance, and because they wish their ministers to be eligible to preferments in the Irish Protestant Church, which has also retained the name, and has been less completely disendowed. They ordain their priests as follows :—The ceremony takes place at an evening communion, as being more numerously attended than a morning one. After the Gospel has been read, the candidates, wearing Genevan gowns, kneel at the communion rails, and *Veni Creator* is sung. Then the Bishop of North-end (a "returned Colonial," who has somehow acquired jurisdiction over the whole of Scotland), assisted by the Bishop of South-end (who is "in American Orders," whereby he obtains Apostolic authority in England and Wales), lays his hands in silence on the railful of candidates, and proceeds next, while facing them, to pray, with hands extended, that they may "receive the Holy Ghost, to preach and show forth the Lord's death, in accordance with his will." Now, such a ceremony would really have points of resemblance with a primitive ordination, such as the Anglican Ordinal has not ; and it would be not less "capable of a Catholic interpretation." But, would the priests thus ordained be permitted to "celebrate" at High

* Ritualists do acknowledge "American Orders," certainly; but apparently in ignorance of the fact that they have no guarantee of this form having been used continuously.

Church altars without re-ordination, supposing any of them should be converted to the Anglo-Catholic Church, the other main fragment of the Establishment, in whose Ordinal the "tradition of the instruments" had now been restored, and whose Bishops were bound by a rule of celibacy, and had got as far as mitres and chasubles? Would not these Pontiffs point with justifiable indignation to the declaration signed by the Protestant priest before his ordination, in which it was stated that the words "show forth the Lord's death" were not to be understood of the Eucharist, but of the great Gospel truth of justification by faith without works?

What, then, we here contend for is, that, if Anglicans could even momentarily divest themselves of their prepossessions in favour of their Orders, and could view *ab extra* the events of the sixteenth century by which their Church was constituted, they would hardly fail to conclude with Catholics that, whatever may be the nature and value of the Anglican Ministry, certainly the divinely instituted *Sacerdotium* was not transmitted through Barlow and Parker to afford material for countless profanations of sacramental grace. Could they but grasp the notion of the Catholic Church, as the divine Society, one and indefectible, endowed with the full prerogatives of Prophet, Priest and King, and needing no factitious aids to enable her to fulfil her entrusted mission to teach, feed, and rule all nations, the vain and insular imagination that the "English Church" has retained the Apostolical Succession by a special providence, with the view of its discharging a peculiar and important work in connection with "the Church at large," would cease to colour their view, and the hollowness of their claim to possess sacerdotal Orders would be readily discerned.

§ 48. *A Return to the Primâ Facie Evidence.*

The question of Anglican Orders is one which theologians might be willing to study for its own intrinsic interest. The fact that there has been within the Catholic Church no controversy touching the precise nature or the essential requisites of the Sacrament of Holy Order, important enough to lead to detailed authoritative decisions, has resulted in this being perhaps the least fully explored of the various departments of Catholic theology. And moreover, the unprecedented character of the Anglican claim gives it additional importance. Neither East nor West can furnish any other instance of a local Church, breaking off from Catholic unity, and apparently adopting a thoroughly Protestant position, but yet, after the lapse of years, finding herself decked in Catholic ornaments by some of her children, who protest that she has always retained the Catholic Priesthood. And the examination of the claim preferred will be found to involve the discussion of certain questions that have as yet received no full and systematic treatment at the hands of Catholic theologians, the cases never having occurred within the Catholic Church.

But, though the controversy thus has points interesting even if only speculatively examined, the discussion in these pages has had throughout a practical end in view, and that is the removal of what frequently constitutes a hindrance to conversion to the Catholic religion. The case of those who are retained in the Church of England solely by the persuasion that they can obtain true sacraments at the hands of Anglican priests, has been chiefly, if not exclusively, contemplated. The writer has assumed that such

persons have already some acquaintance with the claims of Catholicism, and admit their force. He has assumed, moreover, that they have at least to some extent the necessary dispositions for making their submission to the Church ; for he is by no means desirous of shaking the good faith of those who, even if their belief in Anglicanism were weakened, would not look towards the Catholic Church in such a moral attitude as would eventually ensure their becoming her loyal children. Conversion to Catholicism is not effected by a recognition of the untrustworthiness of other systems ; nor does it consist in a mere intellectual agreement with the truths the Church teaches ; much less in a sentimental admiration for Catholic life and worship. Logic, or emotion, or both, may aid a conversion, but they do not secure it ; and they who are led into the Church by such motives alone, may by the same be led out again after a time. Nor is submission to Rome to be regarded as a mere experiment. If a conversion is to be real and complete, it must be a moral as well as an intellectual act, by which the will freely corresponds to the grace of God ; and it must be based on the three theological virtues of faith, hope, and charity, united with docility and a firm intention to persevere. They who seek to approach the Church on equal terms, who come as patrons, or critics, but not as suppliants or children, are not really qualified to enter the kingdom of heaven, and do not, in fact, become united to the Church's soul by the act of formal reception. They may, of course, obtain this completer union later, if they correspond to the grace given to them ; but, meanwhile, their position must be an anxious one, for they are just the persons to cause scandal by an apparent lapse from a position to which they have never really attained.

This point has here been incidentally noticed, though

it does not directly concern our subject, because it is involved in the practical aim with which this Essay has been written. A mere distrust of Anglican Orders, which its perusal might produce, would not, of course, place any one in the right moral attitude for submission to the Church ; though it would furnish a strong reason for seeking to obtain the necessary dispositions. But, on the other hand, they who were already willing to be reconciled to Rome, and only remained in the Church of England because they doubted whether they would be acting rightly in abandoning what they had been persuaded were true and valid Sacraments, would have that hindrance removed, should they admit the cogency of the arguments herein contained.

Those arguments have been directed against the assertion of modern High Churchmen that their Priesthood is the same as that of the Catholic Church ; and they are immediately concerned with nothing else. Perhaps the strength of the historical argument against Barlow's consecration might lead even moderate High Churchmen to acknowledge the insecurity of their position, unless, indeed, they should be content to fall back on a peculiar view of the effect of coöperation ; but it is mainly on theological grounds that our discussion has been conducted ; and here we have to do only with the advanced school ; for all other Anglicans would maintain that the Catholic doctrine of the Priesthood is a corruption or caricature of the truth ; * and that therefore the Anglican Reformers were justified in reducing the ordination rites to what they might have supposed to be their " primitive simplicity," and that they could do so without prejudice to the validity of the Orders conferred thereby.

But we are not concerned with any such opinion as this, if only because it is admitted to be erroneous by those

whom we address. Men who desire nothing more earnestly than to be accounted Catholic priests, cannot take it as a grievance if they are assumed to hold Catholic doctrine ; and we have already allowed that the Ritualists are really the only logical and consistent High Churchmen in this matter. No assertion of an "Apostolical Succession," which shrinks from admitting, both in theory and practice, all that is involved in the Catholic doctrine of the *Sacerdotium*, really demands the attention of Catholic theologians ; for a half-hearted claim bears its own refutation. If Anglican clergymen are not *sacerdotes* in the Catholic sense, they are laymen in relation to the Catholic Priesthood ; and it is thus that they have always been regarded by the Church since Anglicanism was first established. Inasmuch, then, as we are not arguing either with sceptics or ordinary Protestants, we have assumed that there exists in the world, by divine appointment, a Christian Priesthood, empowered to discharge supernatural functions, and in particular to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass ; and it is merely the possession by the Anglican Church of this great reality that we have called in question. To say that the High Church claim has been in these pages disproved, would be to employ language hardly applicable to the case ; but it may fairly be urged that a strong preponderance of improbability has been shown ; and more than this can neither be looked for nor needed. So momentous a claim has no right to be insisted upon in practice, unless the balance of evidence be very much in its favour.

When, then, we have affirmed that in the judgment of Catholics an Anglican clergyman cannot be regarded as a Catholic priest, we need say no more. As a minister of the Established Church he has privileges and powers, of which no Catholic can deprive him. Whatever merits, and they have not been a few, the Anglican Church may

have had, and may still retain, he may claim his share in them, as her agent and representative. But, when he steps beyond his own province, and comes forward in a character not warranted by the history of his own community, out of harmony with the formularies to which he has solemnly given his assent, and protested against by the living authorities to whom he owes submission, the claim demands some such challenge as has here been given ; for, however honestly put forth, it is still in itself false and misleading, and only serves to place a hindrance in the way of those whom God's grace is guiding into the one haven of his truth.

It was with this practical aim in view that prominence was in these pages given to the *primâ facie* evidence ; for its persuasiveness is greater than that of any bare arguments ; and, beyond all question, both parties in the controversy are influenced by the "urgency of visible facts" more than by a carefully-balanced consideration of the historical and theological evidence, which is accessible only to a few, while fewer still are able fairly to estimate its force. On the one hand, it is the great fact and the undoubted success, up to a certain point, of the "Catholic revival" in the Church of England which really weighs with Ritualists in their maintenance of the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry ; while, on the other hand, it is the utter unlikelihood that this assertion should be correct which ordinarily leads Catholics to treat it with contempt, and to regard as little better than waste of time any detailed examination and refutation of the claim.

There will be, then, a certain propriety if we return briefly in conclusion to this *primâ facie* evidence, so easily appreciated by all, and point out that, however great may be the success of the modern Catholicising movement—and of course it seems to be marvellously great to those

whose little world is there—yet its cogency as an argument is really shattered by a consideration of two simple facts, which are within the reach of all persons who have the ordinary powers of observation, and whom prejudice does not forbid to see.

These two facts are, first, the essential novelty of the High Church claim, and secondly, the moral impossibility of applying that claim as widely as it must be applied, if it is good for anything at all. The points are important, and, though they have already been referred to, they must receive fuller consideration.

As to the recent origin of the Ritualistic revival, it is to be noted that it is not yet fifty years since a small but clever band of Oxford clergymen, learned in the Fathers, and in the writings of the Anglo-Catholic divines, whose very names had well-nigh slipped out of popular remembrance during the previous century, perceiving the insufficiency and unhistorical character of the prevalent Protestantism of the day, began to issue theological Tracts, in which ecclesiastical principles, now so widely recognised that few can appreciate the dismay with which their assertion was then received, were elaborately and eloquently defended. Although no external sign indicated the drift of the new teaching—for many years the most advanced among the Tractarians were content with the old-fashioned surplice and black scarf, stood at the north end of the table, and left the paten and chalice to the care of the clerk at the end of the service—popular hostility was at once aroused. What would have happened had a “function” been even once attempted, such as is now common in scores of churches, it is impossible to imagine. For, even though no one dared so much as whisper the word “Mass” as applicable to the Anglican Communion Service, the Oxford doctrines were every-

where denounced as Popish, and as utterly irreconcilable with the established system. With barely an exception the Bishops charged against Tractarianism, and that not in such smooth sentences as they now employ to condemn Ritualism ; but its promoters were denounced as traitors, and were plainly bidden to find their true home elsewhere. And in due time the Bishops were taken at their word. In the course of ten or twelve years a considerable number of clergymen, and a smaller, though not insignificant band of laymen, became impregnated with the principles of the Tracts, and from among these the more logical and fearless, corresponding with a special grace received, saw not only the truth, but where alone it could be faithfully obeyed ; and they stepped across what was then the broad and seldom traversed gulf that divides England from Rome. What terrible sacrifices they had then to make, of home, property, friends, relations, and even of their own good name, modern converts, who are rarely called upon to endure such trials, can hardly know.

But the great majority of the Tractarians, many learned and pious men being among them, remained behind ; and it would be rash and ungenerous to deny that, generally speaking, they remained in perfectly good faith. It may be that God had an important work for them to do on behalf of his Church, though that work was to be done outside it. Various considerations, which have been referred to above, led them to conclude that they were already within a true branch of the Catholic Church, and in possession of valid Sacraments and of the powers of the Priesthood, the true nature of which was as yet not very clearly recognised ; and their interpretation of expressions used by the Fathers, coupled with strong prejudices against certain details of the actual religion of Rome,

persuaded them that their "position as Catholics in the Church of England" was proof against attack.

Accordingly they set to work to obtain a wider recognition for their doctrines, expounding and defending them in sermons and instructions, and after a time giving them practical illustration through the medium of ceremonial. This last, however, until twelve or fourteen years ago, was but a very lame affair in the few churches in which it was attempted. Quite recently it has become bolder and more expressive, and has been backed up by fervid and persuasive preaching; by good music, painting, and even by sculpture, as well as by the wholesale distribution of quasi-Catholic manuals of devotion. And, though it has lately in some few cases received a check, through decisions in the Courts of Law, there are signs that it will spread laterally, if it cannot advance further, and, in a modified form, pervade the whole Establishment. Modern Ritualism, however, though thus founded on Tractarianism, can hardly be reckoned its legitimate development. Its promoters are, generally speaking, men of a different stamp from the High Churchmen of forty years ago, and appeal in some measure to different principles. Submission to authority, and respect if not reverence for Rome, characterised the leaders of the elder school; whereas fierce railing against the Roman Church, caustic criticism of every act of the Anglican Bishops, followed by stubborn resistance to their counsels and monitions, together with professions of readiness to obey an ideal authority, the non-existence of which, and the impossibility of its ever being called into existence, secure meanwhile an indefinite period of licence—these constitute some of the supports of the platform from which the Ritualistic priest addresses his flock, and that with marked success. For, in spite of persistent opposition from almost all the

powers in Church and State, and in spite of secessions from their ranks, either to Rome, or more numerous, though less observed, to Liberalism, the new teachers have hitherto gained ground every year, and seem likely to succeed before long in entirely transforming the Anglican religion. They have systematically fed their Church with unaccustomed food ; but she has contrived to swallow most of it, to digest a good deal, and even to assimilate a part. Catholic theology, ceremonial, and devotions have been poured down her throat, while she hardly knew what was being done ; and now that she has been fairly aroused from her "period of lethargy" she finds herself a changed creature. Colonial Bishops, who may have been content to remain some years absent from their native land, can hardly, it is said, recognise on their return the religion in which they had been educated. But, should they decide to sever themselves from their distant flocks, with the view of embracing a new sphere of labour in an English country parish, they are not usually loth to fall in with a system which makes them such exceedingly dignified personages, and which values their benediction so much more highly than their former subjects had done.

In fact, the Anglican "Branch" has within the last five-and-twenty years been decorated with borrowed foliage and fruit,

Miraturque novas frondes et non sua poma.

And, although full-blown sacerdotal pretensions are as yet in possession of less than a tithe of the churches, "moderate men" are following close on the heels of the Ritualists, and even the Evangelicals (not to speak of the Wesleyans), have caught the contagion ; so that at the present day fully two-thirds of the Anglican clergy have some vague belief in supernatural powers conferred on them by their Episcopal ordination ; though out of this great number

barely a thousand are logical and consistent enough to affirm that these powers place them at the altar to say Mass, and in the confessional to absolve. Many of these last, however, have obtained the recognised sacerdotal *cachet* at least as successfully as the supernumerary who appears in cope and stole in the burial scene in "Hamlet;" and thus (so far as they are themselves concerned), have taken the sting out of the old-fashioned *prima facie* Catholic objection to the validity of Anglican Orders,—viz., that "parsons do not look like priests."

That there is something histrionic in the introduction of Catholic ceremonial into Anglican churches can hardly be denied. It is on æsthetic grounds that the promoters of the movement prefer their own "high celebrations" to a Catholic High Mass. The general effect is more imposing, the picturesque has been more carefully studied, the appointments are handsomer, the music is better, there are no awkward pauses in the service, and from first to last the whole performance goes with a swing which carries away even those who came to protest. It may be so; and yet the theatrical character of the whole remains. The coronation of Charles VII. at Rheims in 1430 would probably have been voted a rough and ready, if not altogether a slow and shabby affair, by those who are enraptured with the showy splendour of the same scene as presented in the opera of *Jeanne d'Arc*; and yet the one was a great reality, while the other is not. If, then, the Ritualists have the means of making representations of Catholic ceremonial more telling than the original, it argues nothing in favour of the substantial nature with them of that great act of Sacrifice, to which among Catholics the ritual forms an indispensable appendage, but nothing more.

And few will be found seriously to maintain that the

new mode of Anglican worship is not imitated from Catholic and even from strictly Roman sources ; although in two or three churches, by a grotesque parody of the obsolete Sarum rites, the clergy have tried to persuade themselves and their flocks that they are merely restoring to the Church of England her "ancient and lawful inheritance." Nor is the imitation confined to ritual. Retreats have been borrowed from the Jesuits, parochial Missions from the Passionists and Redemptorists, Theological Colleges from the Seminaries ordered to be established by the Council of Trent, Brotherhoods, Sisterhoods, Guilds, and Confraternities from the innumerable Catholic associations bearing these and similar names, and now finally the use of popular hymns and devotions from the Oratory ; and all this, not merely in the general idea, but commonly down to the minutest details of rule and language ; and so systematically and pertinaciously, and with such careful concealment of the sources whence all had been taken, that persons brought up under Ritualistic training, or such as had borrowed in good faith only at second-hand, have been known to inquire with ingenuous simplicity, "Whether it is true that Roman Catholics go to confession too, and have Missions and Retreats like us?"

The modern movement is thus especially misleading to those whose age or peculiar circumstances have precluded them from any real experience of the old-fashioned Church of England system. They do not know that the views now common among Low Churchmen were accounted dangerous and extreme in 1833, and that Church ornaments and ceremonies, to-day generally tolerated, if not accepted as legitimate Anglican characteristics, were fiercely and correctly denounced in 1850 as an introduction of "sheer Popery." Thus they are not startled or dismayed (as assuredly their grandfathers would have

been), to hear their clergyman affirm that the use of Latin in public worship, the celibacy of the clergy, the shape of the chasuble, and the question whether the Pope has a Primacy or a Supremacy over the whole Church (for, strangely enough, this last matter is regarded as about as important as a question of ceremonial), are the only serious points on which the Church of England differs from the Church of Rome ; so rapid and so successful has been the approximation in externals, while in spirit the most extreme men are as far as ever removed.

Strange as all this must necessarily appear to those who have had the happiness to be from childhood within the fold of Christ, yet they may be willing to admit that in the long run good (though not unmixed good), will come of so remarkable a movement. They cannot fail to see that by its means great truths are brought home to thousands, who would never have listened to the Church teaching them herself. And they notice that Ritualism is acting as a powerful solvent, breaking up the frost-bound traditions of three centuries of Protestantism, melting its stubborn prejudices, and weakening the hitherto invincible dominion it has maintained over the minds of the mass of Englishmen ; and, through the channel thus reopened (though not without a previous period of violence and of danger to the faith, while the ice is being carried down to the sea), they anticipate that the stream of Catholic truth will eventually be enabled once more to flow. Nevertheless, they cannot fail also to observe that meanwhile a cloud of confusion is thrown across the simple message of the Catholic Church, and that many who desire to be the obedient children of the truth, are, through the influence of Ritualism, hindered from recognising where alone the truth is fully and securely to be found.

Thus much, then, may be said as to the origin and history of the modern movement, with the view of calling attention to the complete novelty of its claims, and to its character as a kind of foreign occupation of a Protestant Church. And, since Ritualism puts forth no credentials, nor indeed makes any profession, to be accounted a new revelation, this novelty must be to all persons who think, weighty *primâ facie* evidence against its claims to teach in Christ's name.

Proceeding next to consider the second point referred to above, the wide application that must be given to the High Church claim, if it is tenable at all, we observe that the Ritualist himself does not appear to have a shadow of belief in the Priesthood of a whole host of persons, whom, nevertheless, his theory thus dignifies. And, if this be so, it would follow that his faith in the sacerdotal character of this or that particular High Church clergyman is the result of the appearance or pretensions of the individual, and has no real foundation in authority or fact. For, in truth, if the Ritualistic priest of to-day really and truly offers the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, so have all Anglican clergymen, ever since Parker first set about "ordering ministers" who preferred Genevan gowns to vestments, boards on trestles to altars, and seated communicants to the prostrate, awed, adoring throng. If the High Church clergyman at his quasi-Catholic "celebrations" really has on the altar before him the true Body and Blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, all Anglican ministers from the first have had the same, and all have now, Low and Broad, as well as Moderate and High ; and that too in Ireland, the Colonies, and the United States ; and in the "Reformed Episcopal Church" as well ; for their Orders are as valid as the rest, though perhaps a little more unlawful, if any are valid at all.*

* The attempt made by some High Churchmen to deny the Episcopal

This inclusiveness of the claim would not, of course, be denied in controversy by those who maintain the sacerdotal view of the Anglican Ministry ; but it is impossible not to see that it is never fairly faced, and in practice is simply ignored and put out of sight by the great majority of Ritualists. Two illustrations of this fact may fitly close this section ; for they will need no commentary to illustrate their significance.

character of Dr. Gregg, and the validity of the Orders he confers, is inconsistent with their own position, and is supported by arguments which are in fact suicidal. An article in the "Guardian" for May 15th, 1878, is very significant. It is a pity the writer cannot "see himself as others see him." The substance of his criticisms might have come from the pen of a Catholic in 1578. "The Reformed Church of England," he says, "is nothing better than an arrant fraud. It is no Church of England at all, but a mere knot of Puritan Non-conformists who are striving to push the fortunes of a new sect under the outward semblances of Churchmanship. . . . Surely these very Low Churchmen do not imagine that the mere mechanical act of the laying on of hands by one who has himself undergone a similar process from a Bishop acting without authority conveys grace and virtue *ex opere operato*? This is indeed to set up the outward instruments of grace in a way that the very highest of High Churchmen would disclaim. But if it is not the mere mechanical act of imposition of hands that avails, then both mission and commission from the Church are necessary before the official acts can bear any efficacy. Do Drs. Gregg and Cummins believe that the mere outward forms of consecration make each of them a channel, or rather reservoir, of Divine grace, so that they can distribute it up and down the land at their will? It is the oddest misconception the Church has heard of since the days of Simon Magus." The following week Dr. Jenner, the most "advanced" of Anglican Bishops, writes, "It is understood that they object to our Ordinal, which, *sufficient* as it undoubtedly is, will not (I say it advisedly) bear any more paring down." It would be interesting to know whence the Bishop obtained this extraordinarily accurate knowledge (such as no Catholic theologian shares), of the essentials of ordination, which enables him to state with certainty that the Reformers pared down the Ordinal precisely to sufficiency point, so that, as he adds with oracular solemnity, another paring would do for it. The controversy has since been continued in the High Church newspapers, and reveals a marvellous lack of definite principles by which to judge the case. The discussion, however, must do good in the end, for the parallel of the Elizabethan consecrations cannot fail to suggest itself. Mr. Bailey seems to have felt this when writing his new pamphlet, "Are the Ministers of the Reformed Episcopal Church validly ordained?" but he is content to meet the difficulty with such ridiculous assertions as "the Church of England never did secede from the Church of Rome at all"; the separation "was not upon any question of doctrine," &c. (pp. 19, 20).

Three gentlemen "of different schools of thought" present themselves before an Anglican Bishop to receive "priest's Orders," and all undergo the same process of ordination. The Broad Churchman returns to his College and thinks no more about the matter, though he is aware there is nothing now to hinder him from taking the next good living that falls vacant. The Low Churchman returns to his parochial work, rejoicing that he has no more examinations to get through, and that he is eligible for preferment; but, as his Vicar always "takes the Communion Service," his duties remain unchanged. Now, no Ritualist would honour either of these men with the title of "priest," nor would he ever think of him as such, though he might nevertheless count him among his friends. And yet they have been made priests as truly as the third candidate, who, after submitting to the same ceremony with thinly-disguised contempt for its "dreadfully Protestant" character, goes back to his Catholic-looking Church, and there, safe from the Bishop's eye, arrays himself the next morning in alb and chasuble, and proceeds to "say Mass" with ceremonies that would have vexed and perplexed his Lordship, had he been told that they were the inevitable outcome of his imposition of hands.

In fact, the Ritualistic clergy practically ordain themselves; or at least transform themselves from parsons to priests by an act of their own will. Thus, as a second illustration we may notice that, when a clergyman, who for years had been content with the old-fashioned Church of England system, adopts High Church views, perhaps even joins the Society of the Holy Cross, buys a Roman collar, and takes to vestments and incense, he is at once accepted by his new friends in an entirely new character. He is "a priest" now, and gives absolution with the

authority of an Apostle. When at home he may be "seen" at stated hours in the vestry, or in some corner of the church—the Bishop is so foolish as to refuse him a confessional, lest he should appear to countenance what in fact he winks at—but his jurisdiction is not confined to the narrow limits of his own parish or diocese ; he is prepared to give absolution when on his holiday at the sea-side or abroad with equal freedom and effect ; and all this goes on for some years. But after a time he wearies of Ritualism, gives it up as far as his now Ritualistic flock will let him, preaches Broad Church doctrine, but says Mass and hears confessions no longer. He goes back with a sense of relief, if not to his whiskers and white tie, at least to opinions in accordance therewith ; and, his Priesthood having now faded out of view, he becomes an ordinary clergyman again, finds himself on intimate terms with his Bishop (who in his Ritualistic days would have nothing to say to him), and on the next vacancy is appointed an honorary Canon.

These are no fancy sketches, but only slightly coloured accounts of what goes on before our own eyes ; and they are significant of the nature and value of the Anglican Ministry.

§ 49. *Gravity of the Responsibilities involved in the Maintenance of the Extreme High Church Claim.*

The end of our discussion has now been reached ; and we will add only a few remarks on some of the consequences which are involved either in the admission or the rejection of that claim, which has been in these pages disputed.

There are not a few Anglicans who believe that their Orders are called in question by Catholics, mainly because these last are conscious that their own position becomes untenable if Anglican clergymen are true priests. This, however, is quite a mistake. If it were clear beyond all question that the national Church had retained valid Orders, Catholics in England would be none the worse off on that account, nor do they gain anything by a disproof of the claim. As has been noted above, the possession of Orders does not constitute "a Church ;" and, although High Churchmen should be ever so confident that the arguments we have had before us throw no serious doubt on the sacerdotal character of their Ministry, much would still remain to be done before they could justify their remaining apart from the rest of Christendom. However great, therefore, in the case of individuals may be the accidental importance of the question of Orders, it is after all merely subsidiary to the main issue. It is the being in voluntary communion with heretics and schismatics, instead of being united to the Vicar of Christ on earth, which renders, on Catholic principles, the position of Anglicans so unsafe. The question is not one of valid Sacraments, but of salvation. Valid Orders may secure the former, but not the latter. True Sacraments deliberately

received at the hands of true priests who are not of the true Church do not confer saving grace.

When, then, Anglicans have carefully weighed the arguments that are brought against the validity of their Orders, and are satisfied that they are insufficient to neutralise their own arguments in its favour, they have accomplished, no doubt, one thing which is absolutely necessary, on the principles which they have accepted, to render their position defensible ; but they are still far from having established what is also essential—viz., that the Anglican Church has true mission and jurisdiction, whether in England or elsewhere. To build on nothing but the possession of Orders is like attempting to balance a pyramid on its apex. When the Church of England has been successfully cleared from the charges of heresy and schism ; when its claim to teach, not merely as a national and human, but as a divine institution, has been made good ; then to refute the objections brought against its Orders will be to crown the work ; if, indeed, to prove them at all should then be any longer considered necessary ; for they will have been covered by the acknowledgment of the more important claim. The returned prodigal, once recognised and welcomed by his father, has no need to prove in detail that his features are those by which the family is known.

Some of the advanced school have felt the justice of this distinction, and have therefore deprecated any attempt to uphold the validity of Anglican Orders by an appeal to documentary evidence, or by a theological controversy. "We are sure," they would say, "that we are within the Church, and we therefore take our Orders for granted, just as the Roman Catholics do."

This, no doubt, is a comfortable doctrine, and is likely to gain many adherents. But it is clearly a begging of

the whole question. Who can be reasonably sure that he is in the Church and a true Catholic, when all the Bishops in the world, who believe themselves to be Bishops in the Catholic sense, agree that he is not? What can he have to make him sure, beyond his own private opinion, or the bare assertion of his "priest," in whom neither Catholic nor Anglican Bishops recognise sacerdotal power and authority? Certainly, the Prayer-book puts into his mouth the words, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," "in one Catholic and Apostolic Church;" but these phrases are borrowed from Catholic sources, and have with Catholics a very clear and definite meaning, irreconcilable with Anglicanism, as such, being "a part of the Church." And where is the Anglican doctrine on the nature of the Church to show that in the Prayer-book they bear the Catholic sense, and are not rather another example of that deceptive retention of Catholic language, designed to facilitate the comprehension of the English nation in the Anglican Church, by veiling the completeness of that lapse from the Catholic to the Protestant platform which the Church of England suffered in the sixteenth century?

We protest, therefore, against the assumption, in the face of the hostile witness of the Catholic *orbis terrarum*, that the Anglican Church is a "pure and Apostolic branch," from which assumption the validity of its Orders is to be inferred. If its Catholicity can be maintained at all, it must be proved step by step; and, meanwhile, the nature and succession of its Ministry must not be left out of account, anyhow by those who claim to act and speak as Catholic priests.

Catholics, then, it must be repeated, would not be the losers if Anglican Orders were shown to be certainly valid. They would be distressed, no doubt, to have to

acknowledge the grave material profanations of the Eucharistic Presence, which would be daily occurring on all sides ; and they would observe with regret that the possession of Orders was used as a barrier to hinder conversions to Rome ; but they would suffer nothing else. Certainly they would not become schismatics, save in the judgment of dreamers, who have invented theories about the inalienable rights of national Churches, with the view of bolstering up their own false position. Lutherans in the sixteenth century talked of "Tridentine schismatics," just as High Churchmen of to-day talk of "Vaticanists," or "the Roman schism ;" but such language deceives only those who use it, and in the end must recoil on their own heads.

Anglicans may protest that "God has placed them in the Church of England ;" but he has done so only in the sense in which he has placed Presbyterians in Presbyterianism, and Wesleyans in Wesleyanism ; or again as he placed St. Augustine in Manicheism, and St. Paul in Pharisaism. And, although he may and does give them great graces where they are, yet the greatest of all will be that which enables them, if their good will correspond to it, to place themselves

"under Mary's smile,
And Peter's royal feet."

To be content to remain in a confessedly unsatisfactory and logically indefensible position, on the pleas that they did not seek it, but found themselves in it, that grace has therein been consciously received, and that it furnishes an opening for great services, at least indirectly, to the Catholic cause, is as if Saul of Tarsus should have professed himself satisfied with the vision vouchsafed to him outside the gates of Damascus, and should have courteously dismissed Ananias, declining to be baptised or to have the

scales removed from his eyes, on the ground that in his present position he would have great opportunities for doing the work of the Church among his Jewish brethren. After all, a man must secure the salvation of his own soul first, and then will be the time for him to talk of his work on behalf of others.

Thus much, then, may be said as to the position of the Ritualists, even if we allow that their Orders are valid. But if, on the other hand, after a careful study of the question, according to their opportunities, they see that they have been mistaken in putting their trust in the Anglican Priesthood, whether they become Catholics or not, it is clear that they cannot without sin go on as they are. Some, no doubt, would be ready to give up their Catholic principles and practices, when they have found that there is no legitimate home for them in the Church of England ; others would be disposed to seek for valid Orders in the East or elsewhere ; but surely the more prudent would, as soon as may be, withdraw from their false position, with the view of making their submission to the Vicar of Christ ; though it is true that their previous Ritualistic training, and the prejudices and un-Catholic spirit it has engendered, might render it a difficult task for them to obtain the dispositions necessary for such an act. But, even if they should be unable to obtain conviction either on the one side or the other, it is obvious that, to continue publicly to act as priests, without any certainty of the reality of their own Priesthood, is a most rash and dangerous course. Neither their Bishops nor their formularies, as ordinarily understood, bear them out in professing to say Mass or forgive sins ; and these are matters too serious for trifling. If they are not concerned to know that Catholics, all the world over, regard their pretensions as unfounded ; if even self-

respect does not forbid them to act a part which they cannot certainly affirm has been entrusted to them, yet surely charitable consideration for those who take their words and actions as an infallible guide, will make them hesitate to persist in practices which may sooner or later prove to have been a very serious though indeliberate deception.

The position of the laity who worship in Ritualistic churches is in several respects peculiar. Potentially they have all the freedom possessed by other Protestants, from whom in their external religion they differ so widely ; for they may accept or reject what is taught from the pulpit ; and in practice they may conform to the new system, or not, as they please. They may make a rule of "hearing Mass" on all Sundays, and of going to confession before communion ; but these obligations are purely self-imposed ; and no power on earth can blame them if they keep them one month, and not the next, at their will. They have thus a freedom which Catholics do not possess. On the other hand, they have accepted principles which may practically destroy this freedom, and reduce them to a bondage to which Catholics are strangers. They have been pleased to accept their clergyman as "a Catholic priest," and they feel bound to be consistent in treating him as such. So far, then, as they are concerned, he becomes invested with almost Papal authority ;—indeed, his authority may be said to be more than Papal ; for a Catholic ecclesiastic, whether priest, Bishop or Pope, is bound by a thousand rules and traditions, whereas an Anglican priest is bound only so long as he pleases by those of his own making, or has voluntarily accepted ; and against his decision there is no appeal. Ideally, of course, there is the appeal which Catholics have to the Bishop ; but of this no Ritualist, clerical or lay, can make any use, for the Bishop washes

his hands of the whole affair. Whatever, then, in the Ritualistic pulpit (or in the columns of the "Church Times," for that matter), is prefaced with the words "The Church teaches," becomes to the ardent disciple an infallible definition of truth ; though it be in fact no more than the private opinion of the preacher or editor, whose acquaintance with his subject need be only very moderate.

Similarly, in the Anglican confessional "direction" comes to the penitent with what he conceives to be divine authority ; yet legitimate authority has no place there ; and there is no possible guarantee of the amateur confessor having grasped so much as the first principles of moral theology ; indeed, the strangely tyrannical rules which he is known occasionally to have imposed on his subjects, in regard to matters in themselves indifferent, where Catholic directors would have been bound to allow the utmost liberty, is pretty clear evidence that he is utterly unfitted, through his ignorance of his self-imposed duties, for the responsible office of a director of souls.

The fact, however, remains, that the Ritualistic priest is to his people infallible (though they would not use the term), in strict imitation of the position which a Catholic pastor holds in relation to his flock ; and in this case on rational grounds, the infallibility of the Church being assumed, for he is to them her representative, and when he speaks with authority, he is giving, not his own private opinion, but what he is himself bound to believe, on pain of ceasing to be a Catholic. His infallibility is thus official ; whereas that of the Anglican priest is personal, in a sense in which no Catholic believes even the Pope to be infallible. It is personal, inasmuch as the authority with which he speaks, either in the pulpit or confessional, has never been delegated to him, but originates in his own self-assertion, and depends for its support chiefly on the

attractiveness with which his social position, his natural gifts, and his University education, invest his teaching and direction. Moreover, on the personal authority of their Vicar or favourite curate, the congregation of one Ritualistic church accepts as "Catholic teaching" what at another is denounced as insufficient or unsound ; and this teaching, which is thus variable, is not infrequently concerned with matters of grave dogmatic and practical importance. And in other respects this personal authority, however widely and enthusiastically it may be accepted in its day, rests on a very precarious foundation. When the popular priest is removed by death or preferment, his "views" are removed too ; and his successor, though also a High Churchman, will probably be found to have "widely different opinions on several of the doctrinal questions of the times." Yet his teaching, in turn, if he be a man of tact, and keep up or "develope" the ceremonial, will soon have enthusiastic adherents ; for the members of a Ritualistic congregation, however much they may differ among themselves in matters of faith, are at least agreed in this, that they believe wholly in their priests.

These considerations should make an Anglican clergyman, who is not confident about the character and succession of his Orders, hesitate to teach his people, whether by word or act, that he is a Catholic priest, and can say Mass and absolve. To come forward in such a character when he is certainly not bound to do so, and when all the most consistent traditions of Anglicanism condemn his act, is not a safe proceeding, unless it be done in perfectly good faith. It involves tremendous responsibilities ; it is practically the introduction of a new religion into the Established Church ; and the dismay, distress and shipwreck, which must inevitably be the lot of his well-intentioned but too trustful followers, when they learn from

his own repudiation of his former position, that what they had received from his lips as certain truth, was after all but an ill-founded opinion, ought to be enough to deter those who are not already invincibly prejudiced in favour of the Ritualistic theory, from placing themselves deliberately in a responsible position, from which they may find it difficult to withdraw, even when they have found reason to believe that they have no business there. Nothing but the most profound conviction of the reality of the Anglican Priesthood can justify a man in playing such a part.

Should, however, the High Church clergyman disclaim the position of an infallible teacher, he will be all the more ready to recognise the justice of a further criticism which, in connection with this subject, may be passed on some other of his proceedings. He forbids his followers, under pain of sin, from entering Catholic churches, from conversing or corresponding with Catholics, and from reading Catholic books. We will confine our attention to this last point. By what authority, if he be not infallible, does he make this rule? Do his questionable Orders, or his still more questionable jurisdiction, warrant him in taking up such a position? That the Holy Roman Church is justified in issuing an *Index Ex-purgatorius*, prohibiting, under certain circumstances, the reading of books calculated to injure the faith or morals of her children, will be admitted by all those who have grasped the Catholic idea of the Church at all. And, in like manner, they will admit that a Catholic priest, as the representative of that Church, rightly prohibits this or that person from reading, or even from retaining in his possession, what is confessed to be a proximate occasion of sin. But, when an Anglican clergyman imitates this example, and claims authority to make similar restrictions

with regard to the study of books in defence or explanation of the Catholic religion, it is clear that he steps beyond the province that has been assigned to him. No one, of course, can blame him if he conscientiously advise or warn as a friend ; but to forbid with priestly authority, and under pain of sin, what is not in itself sinful, is no part of the *rôle* of a minister of a Church which disclaims infallibility, and which never could have existed in its present form without a liberal use of the principle of private judgment. And the prohibition comes with almost grotesque inconsistency from men who claim a position they could not possibly have gained without setting at naught the traditions in which they were educated, without ignoring the opposition of the authorities they were bound to obey, and without making free use of the very Catholic books, the reading of which they prohibit in the case of those who, they fear, will be only too consistent in accepting what they contain. For, commonly enough, the substance of a High Churchman's sermons, his arguments, his method of interpreting Scripture, and his very modes of expression, are borrowed at first or second hand from Roman Catholic publications ; and yet, after having led his flock nine-tenths of the distance towards Rome, and having thus made it impossible for them to remain contented with the old-fashioned Church of England system, by his own personal authority he forbids them to look at the guide-books which he has himself persistently used in making the journey thus far ; and finally, he heaps reproaches upon his disciples, who, more logical than himself, take the last few steps into the City of God, whose gates they see open before them, and this at the bidding of their conscience, and when they are perhaps convinced that they must either heed the invitation, or cease to be Christians in any real sense at all. Catholics may see,

no doubt, in these strenuous efforts to keep people in ignorance of the claims of the Roman Church, an indirect confession of the strength of those claims and of the weakness of the Anglican cause ; but they are none the less bound to protest against them.

Indeed, a High Churchman who is not ignorant of the force of those many converging arguments which point to the duty of submission to the Vicar of Christ, but who is nevertheless content to accept as sufficient to counterbalance them one or more of the common objections, which, at his own request, an Anglican Bishop or priest may have set before him, practically begs the question in favour of the Anglican Church. He knows that these objections, all of them, have been a thousand times considered and refuted by Catholic theologians ; but he does not trouble to study their replies ; he accepts, because he wishes to accept, the criticisms that have been offered him on the *authority* of the clergyman whom he has consulted ; yet official authority he has none, unless the Anglican position be assumed.

Suppose, for example, that a man who has been educated in the Church of England system, finds himself led to the threshold of the Catholic Church by a variety of considerations, moral, theological, historical and rational, and by a mysterious influence, the exact nature of which he has never attempted to analyse. He is aware that learned men are to be found on both sides of the controversy ; he knows that he might go on to a green old age reading their arguments, and yet never be able to make up his mind. Suppose he decides to make his submission to the Church, as being anyhow the safer course. At once he is denounced as hasty, headstrong, weak, vain, restless, cowardly, eccentric, silly, and what not, by men who, in their heart of hearts, know that they ought themselves

to have taken the same step long ago, or else to take it now ; though this they will not acknowledge to themselves, and much less to others. His private life is searched for motives which may be advertised by way of accounting for his act ; and he finds himself placed under the ban of a kind of social excommunication by those whose position, judged by externals, seems hardly to differ from his own. But, meanwhile, (not to speak of other consolations), he knows that he has conscientiously placed himself in willing subjection to that authority which millions of the best and purest and bravest among the disciples of Christ have acknowledged and do acknowledge as divine. And, even though on his first admission into the Church, he may not (as many do) find himself at once at home in her atmosphere, but may be troubled by the clinging to him, at least for a time, of some of the ghosts of old prejudices, temptations, misgivings, questionings, and fears, which had hitherto hindered him from obeying her call ; still he may be sure that every day, month or year, lived in the consistent practice of the religion he has embraced, will afford him fresh proof of its exclusive claim on his allegiance, and will give him further ground for thankfulness for that grace which had brought him into the haven of peace.

On the other hand, suppose he virtually admits the claim of the Anglican Church, and allows to Anglican objections an extrinsic force in consideration of the position of those who raise them. Thus minded he takes the train to Cambridge, and calls (say) on the Laudian Professor of Primitive Christianity to ask his advice. This learned divine expresses genuine sympathy, but at the utmost he can only leave his enquirer in a state of doubt. He points out that "the question between England and Rome is one which is concerned simply with the correct

text and correct interpretation of the Fathers of the first five centuries." When scholarship and collation of manuscripts shall have done for the Fathers what they are doing for the New Testament, he thinks there will be some prospect of the controversy being begun on a satisfactory platform. "Meanwhile," he concludes, "are you not satisfied that modern Romanism cannot be accounted the legitimate representative of the religion of St. Athanasius? And even should you be able to recognise superficial resemblances,—yet, let me ask you how you can get over the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon, and St. Gregory's repudiation of the title of Universal Bishop?"*

The enquirer is silenced; he knows of no reply to make; or, if he does, he feels it would be unbecoming in him to argue with a man, his superior in learning, to whom he has come for advice. His very coming implies that he desired, or at least expected, to have difficulties set before him, such as should hinder him from yielding to that mysterious influence which was leading him to Rome. He knew before he came that the Professor was wedded to the Church of England, and could not do otherwise than strenuously advise his questioner on no account to desert her communion. He knew, moreover, that a score of objections to the very existence of God, such as he

* That the religion of the Roman Church of to-day is substantially, and not merely superficially, the religion of the Church of the Fathers, is vindicated by Cardinal Wiseman in his "Essay on Ancient and Modern Catholicity," ("Essays," vol. i. p. 537); and also in the Preface to the "Via Media," and in the "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk," ("Difficulties of Anglicans," vol. ii. p. 207). The force of the so-called 28th Canon of Chalcedon, (which even the Greeks did not claim as an approved act of the Council until the time of Photius), has been discussed by Döllinger ("History of the Church," vol. ii. p. 252, tr. Cox); and by Mr. Thompson ("Unity of the Episcopate," p. 130); and the sense in which St. Gregory disclaimed the title of "Universal Bishop," is pointed out in the "Dublin Review" for December, 1844, and September, 1846; and in the "Via Media," vol. i. p. 188.

would himself find it very difficult to answer, could be raised by clever men, whose bent is in that direction, should he have decided to consult one of them, instead of the Laudian Professor. He gets, therefore, only what he was bound to expect ; and so, treading down his " Roman tendencies," he makes note of the unanswerable difficulties proposed to him, that he may reproduce them to himself when those tendencies trouble him again, as they assuredly will at no distant date, if it be indeed his conscience enlightened by grace which is pointing him to the Catholic Church.*

But surely it is hard to maintain that God has willed his people to come to the knowledge of his truth through the setting of such historical and theological puzzles as these. The Catholic religion rests on a simpler basis than an essentially controversial system like the Anglican. " We have not so learned Christ ;" and the act of faith by which " the truth as it is in Jesus " is embraced, need not, and indeed must not, be made to depend on the solution of every difficulty that can be raised ; though he who resolves to seek admission into the Church is confident that explanations of all such difficulties are to be found, and can be produced when the need arises.

* A fair sample of the ordinary stock of plausible objections against Catholicism, which are put by Ritualistic clergymen before people who are on the threshold of the Church, will be found in an article by Dr. Littledale in the " Contemporary Review " for November, 1878. And answers to the more noteworthy of his objections will be found in an article in the same magazine for February, 1879, by the Rev. Fr. Ryder, of the Oratory, and by Mr. Thomas Arnold, M.A., in the corresponding number of the " Month."

§ 50. *A Last Word.*

The writer would be sorry if any expressions he has used should be taken as an accusation of conscious dishonesty against the promoters of Ritualism in general. That he is convinced their position is itself a false one, these pages will have made clear ; but he is equally sure that the mass of those who maintain it are sincerely persuaded that right is on their side. Sooner or later, however, the question cannot fail to come (if it has not come already) before men who are painfully endeavouring to balance themselves midway between the principle of authority and the principle of private judgment, whether they can be sure that they are right, and that Rome is wrong. It is only at such a time of indecision as this that the considerations urged in this Essay can possibly have weight with those whom they chiefly concern ; and that they may not then be too lightly set aside is all the writer ventures to hope.

Of this at least he is sure, that no language here employed would be at all too strong to condemn the folly and wickedness of those who, though all but convinced that their claim to be true priests is vain, should be content, from mere human respect, to go on with their pseudo-sacerdotal functions, rather than abandon a position in which they are pleased to consider that God has need of them. The visible judgments inflicted under the Old Law upon intruders into the duties of the Aaronic Priesthood are figures of the far more fearful spiritual catastrophe which awaits those who, uncalled, unconsecrated and un-sent, dare deliberately to usurp to themselves the powers and privileges of its glorious antitype, the Priesthood

ordained by Christ. If Nadab and Abiu, though the sons of Aaron, were destroyed by fire, because they offered strange incense before the Lord, "which was not commanded them;"—if Core, Dathan and Abiron were swallowed up by an earthquake, because, though not of the seed of Aaron, they "challenged to themselves the Priesthood also;"—and if Ozias was a leper unto the day of his death, because he presumed upon his royal authority, and "his heart being lifted up to his destruction," usurped the sacerdotal office also, being "minded to burn incense upon the altar, which belonged not to him, but to the consecrated priests;"—what penalty shall be in store for those who, wilfully ignorant of the falsity of their position, or, worse still, not really ignorant at all, shall persist in professing to perform tremendous functions that have not been entrusted to them, and shall teach men to reverence in them a sacred character which they have never received?

But on the rest (and they the great majority of the upholders of the High Church claim), refined, pious and transparently sincere men, living under the potent influences "not only of inbred national prejudice, of life-long routine, of grave human authority, of literary and academical associations, but also of the large fragments of Catholic truth which the Established Church of this country has retained and enshrined in the majestic English of its formularies,"*—no condemnation shall here be passed. That they are walking in a vain shadow is the judgment, not only of the Catholic *orbis terrarum*, but of all intelligent men, those of their own way of thinking alone excepted. Yet in God's mysterious Providence their eyes are holden that they should not see in the Roman Catholic Church "the home of unity and truth;" and until they do so by the

* "Dublin Review," No. lx. (New Series), p. 464.

light of faith, they must, with the sanction of their consciences, remain where they are. And let those be fierce against them who have never known how hardly such as have been educated in an atmosphere hostile to the Church are brought to an acknowledgment of the truth of her claims.* “But thou, why judgest thou thy brother, or

* “Illi in vos sæviant, qui nesciunt cum quo labore verum inveniatur, et quam difficilè caveantur errores. Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quam rarum et arduum sit carnalia phantasmata piæ mentis serenitate superare. Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt cum quantâ difficultate sanetur oculus interioris hominis, ut possit intueri Solem suum, . . . illum de quo scriptum est per Prophetam, *Ortus est mihi justitiæ Sol*, et de quo dictum est in Evangelio, *Erat Lumen verum quod illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum*. Illi in vos sæviant qui nesciunt quibus suspiriis et gemitibus fiat ut ex quantulâcumque parte possit intelligi Deus. Postremò, illi in vos sæviant qui nunquam tali errore decepti sunt quali vos deceptos vident. Ego autem qui diù multumque jactatus tandem respicere potui quid sit illa sinceritas quæ sine inanis fabulæ narratione percipitur; qui varias imaginationes animi mei variis opinionibus erroribusque collectas vix miser merui Domino opitulante convincere; qui me ad detergendam caliginem mentis tam tardè clementissimo medico vocanti blandientique subjeci; . . . qui denique omnia illa figmenta, quæ vos diuturnâ consuetudine implicatos et constrictos tenent, et quæsvi curiosè, et attentè audiivi, et temerè credidi, et instantè quibus potui persuasi, et adversus alios pertinaciter animosèque defendi; sævire in vos omnino non possum, quos sicut me ipsum illo tempore ita nunc debéo sustinere et tantâ patientiâ vobiscum agere quantâ mecum egerint proximi mei cùm in vestro dogmate rabiosus et cæcus errarem. . . . In Catholicâ enim Ecclesiâ, ut omittam sincerissimam sapientiam ad cujus cognitionem pauci spiritales in hac vitâ perveniunt, ut eam ex minimâ parte quia homines sunt sed tamen sine dubitatione cognoscant, cæteram quippe turbam non intelligendi vivacitas sed credendi simplicitas tutissimam facit; ut ergo hanc omittam sapientiam quam in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ esse non creditis; multa sunt alia quæ in ejus gremio me justissimè teneant. Tenet consensus populorum atque gentium; tenet auctoritas miraculis inchoata, spe nutrita, caritate aucta, vetustate firmata; tenet ab ipsâ Sede Petri, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem Episcopatum successio Sacerdotum; tenet postremò ipsum Catholicæ nomen, quod non sine causâ inter tam multas hæreses sic ista Ecclesia sola obtinuit, ut cum omnes hæretici se Catholicos dici velint, quærenti tamen peregrino alicui ubi ad Catholicam conveniatur, nullus hæreticorum vel basilicam suam vel domum audeat ostendere. Ista ergo tot et tanta nominis Christiani carissima vincula rectè hominem tenent credentem in Catholicâ Ecclesiâ, etiamsi propter nostræ intelligentiæ tarditatem vel vitæ meritum veritas nondum se apertissimè ostendat. Apud vos autem, ubi nihil horum est quod me invitet ac teneat, sola personat veritatis pollicitatio; quæ quidem si tam manifesta monstratur ut in dubium venire

thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ."

The writer has only to add that all he has written, whether in substance or in detail, is unreservedly submitted to the judgment of the Holy Roman Church; to whose mind, which is the mind of Christ, he desires in all things to be conformed.

non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis rebus quibus in Catholicâ teneor; si autem tantum promittitur et non exhibetur, nemo me movebit ab eâ fide quæ animum meum tot et tantis nexibus Christianæ religioni adstringit."—St. Augustine, Cont. Epist. Fundam. Manich., capp. 2-4.

APPENDIX.

NOTE I. (to p. 5).

The Alleged Disloyalty of Ritualism.

THE charge of disloyalty is one to which High Churchmen are naturally sensitive, and they repudiate it with indignation. Yet it is in itself just or unjust, in accordance with the view of the character of the Church of England which is accepted. If High Churchmen are correct in regarding the position of the Anglican Church as parallel with that of the little Jansenist community in Holland, if, that is, their Orders are undoubtedly valid in the Catholic sense, the charge of disloyalty preferred against their doctrine and ceremonial is manifestly unjust. But, if their Church be what all save they themselves believe it to be, *i.e.*, not a sacerdotal community, there is no injustice whatever in saying that Ritualism is in itself disloyal; while at the same time its promoters may be acquitted of conscious disloyalty, on the ground that they are honestly mistaken. The staunch supporters of the movement are loyal enough to their own ideal of the Church of England; they are desperately loyal to it; and they profess their readiness to undergo martyrdom rather than surrender their allegiance. That their work in the long-run must turn to the advantage of Rome is seen clearly by all but themselves; but they have no tenderness for the

Catholic Church. They are as fierce as Exeter Hall against her ; they sincerely believe that their "system" is the strongest bulwark against her progress ; and they will be the last persons to submit to her rule. Their own personal loyalty to the Anglican system may therefore be fully admitted ; but the fact remains that their proceedings must inevitably appear disloyal to the vast majority of those before whose notice they come ; and hence disastrous results follow. Apparent dishonesty and insubordination on the part of ministers of religion, of the established religion too, who of all men are most bound to set an example of reverence and submission to authority, must necessarily have a bad influence over those whom they teach. And the evil becomes serious when their number increases and the facts are notorious. The men themselves, no doubt, sincerely believe that, if they are called to account for their teaching and practices, they are undergoing persecution from those without, in consequence of their fidelity to their legitimate position ; and they think that they are in like case with the suffering Catholics in Germany or elsewhere. But there is no comparison between the two. When Catholics passively resist oppressive State laws, they do so in obedience to a living authority, which they regard as divine, and of which even their non-Catholic oppressors recognise the significance. Their resistance, therefore, though it may produce temporary disturbance, has in the end a distinct influence for good ; for it is a practical exhibition of the duty of obedience to the higher law. But, when a High Church clergyman is punished for Ritualistic practices, he suffers at the hands of his own lawful superiors, whether in Church or State, for preferring loyalty to his own view of the nature of Anglicanism to loyalty to that estimate of it which his Bishop accepts.

Nevertheless, whatever may be urged against the position of the Ritualists in the Church of England, it is clear that hitherto nothing has been done to render that position practically untenable. If it be true, as no doubt it is, that legislation is powerless against disloyalty, *à fortiori* it is clear that it can do nothing against disloyalty which sincerely believes itself to be loyal. And the prosecutions of Ritualists only tell against their promoters. They can only deal with individuals, and that not impartially. The clergyman, who is sent to prison, suffers as a criminal, ostensibly on account of his practices, but really because he has been unfortunate enough to excite opposition. He has done nothing more, perhaps even less, than his brethren in dozens of other places, whom special circumstances, their social position, their tact, or their engaging manners, have secured from molestation. They are honoured, while he is condemned. Such a policy as this, which treats as criminals, men, whose only crime is committed with impunity and even with applause by hundreds of others, is sure sooner or later to fail. If justice is not impartial it is not justice at all.

The error appears to lie in the fact that the opponents of Ritualism are content to attack its phenomena here and there, while they leave its underlying principle untouched. And the principle on which it all depends is the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry. If this be once admitted, extreme Ritualism is its loyal and logical outcome. Nor will a bare denial of it suffice, for that is not heeded. Nothing to the purpose is done unless the sacerdotal theory of the Anglican Ministry is disproved, as near as may be, by arguments such as its upholders are bound to note. Whether those contained in this Essay bear this character, we must leave to our readers to decide; but it must be allowed that only such

as these can render untenable the Ritualistic position within the Church of England—untenable, that is, from the Ritualist's own point of view ; for on Catholic principles it is untenable already, apart from the question of Orders. The High Church party is strong enough now to prevent the Ordinal from being so far revised in a Protestant direction that even Ritualists would have to admit its insufficiency ; it is necessary, therefore, to show that it was long ago insufficient, or to point out that the actual continuity of the succession cannot be accounted certain. If either of these things be done in such a manner as to demand assent, Ritualism ceases to have a *raison d'être*, and its partisans, whether clerical or lay, have no longer any standing ground within the Church of England. When Anglican Orders are confessed to be untrustworthy, the Public Worship Act, the aggrieved parishioner, Lord Penzance's Court, the appeal to the Privy Council, the monition, the costs, the refusal to obey, the imprisonment and the speedy release, or, as in a recent case, the appeal to the Queen's Bench, and the writ of prohibition, which sets the offender free—all, in fact, that is such a scandal to the friends of the Establishment, will quietly pass out of sight and be needed no more ; the Anglican Bishops will have more peaceful times ; and the rising generation will not be called upon to regard as martyrs, men who persist in refusing obedience to every existing or possible authority. Clearly then, not merely Catholics, but all who love order and justice, may welcome an attempt to disprove the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry, inasmuch as that theory is the source, not only of much perplexity and bitterness, but also of so much apparent disloyalty.

NOTE II. (to p. 12).

The "Order of Corporate Reunion."

It appears that a few members of the more advanced school have recently taken measures to hinder that collapse of Ritualism which would follow from an acknowledgment of the nullity of the Priesthood which has been transmitted in the Church of England from Archbishop Parker. The danger has been foreseen, and in a manner provided against, though the effort is not perhaps calculated to win the gratitude of those for whose benefit it is intended. Indeed, it would be unfair to the great body of High Churchmen to hold them responsible for the strange vagaries of the little knot of misguided men who compose the fraternity described as the "Order of Corporate Reunion." And Ritualists do wisely to repudiate (as they generally have done) all connection with it; for it begins with an implied recognition of the doubtful validity of Anglican baptisms and ordinations, and so insinuates that the "Catholic revival" has hitherto been conducted on an insecure foundation. That an association, which thus stultifies what it is professedly anxious to strengthen, should ever gain any number of adherents, would appear incredible, were it not for the utter laxity of principle, and the hopeless confusion between true and false Catholicism, that Ritualism has produced in a certain class of minds. Counters marked "Catholic" have been so persistently circulated and accepted as good money, that this latest forgery has really a serious chance of gaining currency too.*

* What is to be thought of the mental and moral state of men, who, whatever may be the value of their Orders, certainly possess no particle of jurisdiction over any living creature, and who yet, in their self-assumed capacity as "Rulers

And yet, in spite of the vanity and folly of the new movement, it is not without a certain significance. Its promoters, with all their faults, are evidently shrewd men, who know something of the questionableness of the Ritualistic position (one of them, if report speaks correctly, was but a short time ago reputed the most successful champion of Anglican Orders), and they see that, however confident they may themselves be of the reality of their own Priesthood, it is impossible to prove that reality to the satisfaction of either Orientals or Catholics. They have therefore sought to place their ecclesiastical *status* beyond question; and, according to their own statements, they have actually succeeded in obtaining valid ordination both to the Priest-

of the O. C. R.," can bring themselves to pen and print such an extravagance as the following "official document":—"To the Clergy and Faithful of the Order of Corporate Reunion, grace, peace, and health from the Lord God everlasting, and Our Apostolical Benediction. Beloved in the Faith, the ancient and venerable Rites for conferring Holy Orders in the old Church of England having been either tampered with, rudely mutilated, or deliberately made ambiguous, during the changes of the sixteenth century; and so, in the eyes of many rendered of doubtful import and power: We, the undersigned, after having constantly invoked the aid of the Holy Spirit, have prepared the several Forms in the English tongue [the forms in question are really nothing but translations of the Catholic rites, with certain omissions, notably and characteristically the references to the obligation to perpetual chastity, in the form for ordaining a Subdeacon], which are now set forth and follow, for use in this Our Order. And furthermore, by plenary authority to Us belonging, in right of our respective sacred Orders and Offices, We, by these Presents, do Decree for, and Enjoin upon, all Members of Our Order, that the Forms following, and none other, be henceforth used in all such necessary acts of ordination, consecration, or making valid doubted or doubtful ordinations, as may be done for the advancement of God's honour, the Glory of His Great Name, and the Corporate Reunion of Christendom. Given under Our respective hands and seals this eighth day of December, being the Feast of the Conception of Our Blessed Lady, St. Mary, the Mother of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, in the year of the World's Redemption, 1878.

(L.S.) THOMAS, Rector, O. C. R., Pro-Provincial of Canterbury.

(L.S.) LAURENCE, O. C. R., Provincial of Caerleon.

(L.S.) JOSEPHUS, O. C. R., Provincialis Ebor."

The above will be found "officially" published in the "Reunion Magazine" or February, 1879.

hood and Episcopate. What Bishop, save some unhappy apostate, can have consented to become their accomplice in this act of sacrilege, it is impossible to imagine. On Catholic principles, accepted both in East and West, and in ancient and modern times, such a consecration is in the ecclesiastical order a crime corresponding in guilt to that of some gross violation of the marriage tie in the social order. Whoever thus enters upon the dignity of the Priesthood, not through the door, but climbing up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber. Nor is the guilt confined to the single act of receiving Orders under such circumstances. Each sacerdotal function performed, or each sacrament administered, in virtue of Orders thus obtained, stains the souls of both officiant and recipient with grave sin. This is no modern doctrine, but the teaching of the Saints and Doctors of the Church from the first. When a local Church becomes schismatical, but retains and respects its Orders, there is no guilt in that retention, but rather the contrary. There is guilt, of course, in the original schism ; but in this they have no formal share who are born and bred within the separated Church, nor do they even participate in it, if in good faith they receive its schismatical Orders. But, when men outside the Church covet the sacred character of the Church's Priesthood, and seek to obtain it by stealth at the hands of an unauthorised minister, they may succeed, certainly, in obtaining valid ordination, but only to their own spiritual loss. No blessing can accompany their sacrilegious consecration, and their relation to the Catholic Church becomes worse than it was before. It is on this last point that the founders of this " Order " have been most grievously mistaken. They appear to have been under the impression that they would put the Church of England into a position to treat for corporate

reunion with the rest of Christendom, if they could manage to provide her with Orders, which, however irregularly obtained, should be unquestionably valid. The truth is that their action in this matter will prove to be a special disqualification for the corporate reunion with the Catholic Church of those who identify themselves with this association, for it betrays the existence among them of an utterly un-Catholic spirit. In other words, this new mysterious organisation, by thus deliberately basing itself on an act of sacrilege, has really rendered unattainable the final cause of its own existence, viz., a corporate reconciliation with Rome ; and its members can only become Catholics by individual submission ; but this will hardly be expected of men who have acted such an extraordinary part. As is pointed out in a Note below* if corporate reunion was really all that they had in view, they need not have been so anxious to secure the validity of Anglican Orders ; for non-Episcopal communities, otherwise rightly disposed, can obtain that reconciliation *en masse*, their lack of a true Ministry being readily supplied by the Church.

Perhaps nowhere save in England or America could men have been found, who would gravely take in hand the formation of a new sect (for the "Order" really aims at nothing less), admitting individuals by conditional baptism, and surreptitiously obtaining conditional ordination, and all this professedly with the view that, when the new "Church" has been actually formed, it may be corporately united with the rest of Christendom. Simple-minded people will wonder why the middle state, with its chances of failure, is necessary, and why individuals should not at once address themselves to the main body of the Church. It seems odd to construct a new fragment when it is a question of mending. But, in truth, there is no limit to

* See Note VI. on "Anglicanism and Corporate Reunion."

the follies into which men will plunge when they set up as amateur Catholics outside the Church. That the present scheme will be long-lived is hardly likely. It has attracted but little attention, in spite of its desperate efforts to become notorious by mysteriously advertising its existence, and at the same time coyly concealing the names and occupations of its actual members. The Anglican Bishops seem hitherto to have thought it undeserving of notice ; although its position, unlike that of genuine Ritualists, is wholly irreconcilable with loyalty to the Established Church of England as being in any sense a part of the true Church. Probably they anticipate that, if left to itself, it will fall to pieces of its own accord. Yet, in spite of its absurdity, it may do mischief in its day ; though men of sober sense, who are in earnest about the salvation of their souls, and who happily are humble enough to regard Church-making as not a becoming mode of employing their leisure, will keep aloof from an association which, if it should unfortunately gain adherents, will only bring fresh discredit on the Church of England, and further dishonour on that name of Catholic, which its members coolly assume as their own.

NOTE III. (to p. 16).

Indefectibility of the Church's Unity.

The assumption that the Church's unity has long ago been broken, and that Christendom (meaning by the term the mystical Body of Christ), has been divided, ever since the East was separated from Rome, a thousand years ago, has a tendency to prepossess Anglicans in favour of their theory that the Church of England is "a part of the true Church," and so leads to a prejudice in favour of their Orders.

Fully to meet this misconception, the parent of so many errors, would require a treatise to itself, and cannot, of course, be so much as attempted in a Note. But it may be serviceable to point out that the assumption, which is the first principle of the Anglican position, is really inconsistent with the faith of Catholics in the living and teaching Church. For it is admitted that this alleged loss of the Church's unity involved the loss of her power to speak infallibly, which High Churchmen allow that she possessed up to that time; in other words, this theory concludes that one of the Church's most divine prerogatives has been withdrawn during the latter half of the period of her existence; though that half has surely, not less than the former, needed the guidance of an infallible voice.

The objection of Broad Churchmen and of sceptics to infallibility *in toto* may be logically defensible; but not so this modern doctrine, which is neither Protestant nor Catholic, to the effect that Christ's promises to his Church held good for a time, and then failed; but that, nevertheless, the efforts of the A.P.U.C., the O.C.R., and

other such organisations, will be able to remedy this misfortune after a time ; *i.e.*, that they have a fair prospect of success where the Divine Founder of the Church failed. For to no conclusion short of this are we led by this theory of an originally infallible Church, which was unfortunately so constructed as to be essentially divisible, and so (as indeed was only to be expected), in process of time actually was thus divided, and became fallible, and able only piteously to appeal to "antiquity," without any certain means of interpreting the utterances of those earlier and happier days, which need authoritative explanation as much as the words of Scripture.

"But," it may be urged, "we learn from history that there have always been schisms and reconciliations, separations and reunions ; and what has been once may be again." Catholics, of course, do not deny that various passions have from time to time combined to mar the perfection of the Church's unity ; but they maintain that essentially that unity has never failed, nor ever can ; for such a failure would be the destruction of that Church, which by divine promise and protection is indestructible. At times a diocese, or a province, or a kingdom, or even a whole continent, may have lapsed into schism, and this evil may have continued for a whole generation, or even for longer. But what then ? There is here no parallel to the history of Anglicanism, nor precedent or plea for the position of those who are now within its communion. These separated bodies consistently protested against their isolated position, and sought (perhaps not always honestly) for reunion. They did not renounce their traditional faith and ritual ; and so, according to the doctrine of some theologians, they may, as "pure schismatics" (*i.e.*, as schismatics who were not only free from heresy themselves, but who would not even hold communion with heretics)

be allowed to have still, in a certain sense, belonged to the Church, through their union with Christ, the Church's Head.* But that these communities, great or small, were integrant parts of the Church, and that their separation deprived her of one of her most precious prerogatives, has never been admitted by any theologian ; indeed, such an admission would be altogether fatal to the Catholic doctrine concerning the mystical Body of Christ. It is the Catholic belief in the Church possessing a divinely ordained centre of unity (a point which cannot be entered upon here), which rescues the idea of the Church from degenerating into a mere question of numbers, of majorities, of fraternising national religions, or of an aggregation of independent Bishops. Once let this be firmly grasped, and the Catholic ecclesiastical polity at once takes shape as an indivisible whole ; and separations or schisms no more cause the Church to cease to be her true self, and to forfeit her privileges, than spots or clouds permanently disfigure or hide the sun, or transform it into a discordant constellation of moons.

NOTE IV. (to p. 19).

The Anglican Church and Heresy.

There are among modern High Churchmen those who claim to be fully as sensitive as were their Tractarian predecessors, as to the formal acceptance of heresy by the Anglican Church. They confess that they would feel bound to abandon her communion if such an event should occur.

Various reflections are suggested by this admission

* More on this subject will be found in Note VII. below.

By what act could the Church of England formally accept heresy? What test could be employed to detect the error? Would not a really effective test show that the Church of England had accepted heresy long ago?

An attempt to reply to these questions in detail would run to inconvenient length; nor would it serve any purpose; for there is no recognised position with regard to them which Anglicans generally accept; and each individual would need to have his own defence examined separately, before he would admit in his own case the cogency of the arguments employed. But a few general criticisms may be passed upon what appears to be the ground now commonly occupied by the High Church party.

Definitions of Councils of "the undivided Church" are acknowledged as infallible and binding. This would include the Canons of seven œcumenical Councils, the last of them being the Second of Nicæa, which in 787 condemned the Iconoclasts. But Anglicans are bound to condemn, as "a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God," "the Romish doctrine concerning . . . worshipping and adoration . . . of images." Now, all Catholic theologians hold that "the Romish doctrine" on this subject is precisely that which was enforced under anathema at Nicæa. What proof, then, have Anglicans that, by assenting to this Article (xxii.), they are not condemning a Canon of an œcumenical Council?*

* The judgment of Archbishop Trench on the Iconoclasts may be of service to those who honestly find difficulty in recognising the essential difference between Catholic image-worship and heathen idolatry:—"All the religious earnestness, all which constitutes the quickening power of a Church, was ranged on the other side. Had the Iconoclasts triumphed, when their work showed itself at last in its true colours, it would have proved to be the triumph, not of faith in an invisible God, but of frivolous unbelief in an incarnate Saviour."—"Mediæval Church History," p. 98.

if only on this one point the teaching of the Anglican Church is in formal opposition to the infallible voice of "the undivided Church," it is clear that she makes the acceptance of a heresy a condition of serving in her Ministry.

Whether they hold that "the undivided Church," ceased to exist with the schism of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 872 (who, it is worth noting, had first sought confirmation of his election from Rome), or with the formal excommunication of Michael Cerularius in 1054, Anglicans would maintain that it was about this time that the Church lost her infallibility ; and so they might refuse to acknowledge the binding force of subsequent Councils, *e.g.*, those of the Lateran, which are recognised, of course, by Catholics as œcumenical. But it is not easy to see on what grounds they can withhold this title from the Council of Florence in 1439, for this the Oriental Bishops attended, and signed its decrees. To reject its authority because the Eastern Prelates were actuated by political motives—they were seeking temporal aid from the West against their Ottoman oppressors—and because, with a few exceptions, they repudiated their acts so soon as they had returned home, is to apply a principle of criticism to conciliar decisions which might be effectively employed against formal definitions of earlier Councils, acknowledged by Anglicans as œcumenical ; and it renders vain the appeal to "a future general Council," in which "Romans, Greeks, and Anglicans" shall sit and perchance agree ; for motives of policy would assuredly not be absent from such an assembly. And at Florence, not quite a hundred years, be it noted, before Cranmer became Archbishop of Canterbury, Latins and Greeks united in defining that "the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles ; that he is the true Vicar of Christ ; that

he is the Head of the whole Church, the Father and Teacher of all Christians ; and that to him was given, in the person of Blessed Peter, full power of feeding, ruling and governing the Universal Church, as also is [or, according to the less authentic reading, in such measure as is also] contained in the acts of œcumenical Councils, and in the holy Canons." The Pope's infallibility, accurately defined by the Vatican Council, was implicitly defined in this decree. If "all Christians" constitute the Church, and the Church is infallible, it is clear that "the Teacher of all Christians" cannot be liable to err in his formal teaching. It is absurd to attempt to explain away the words as forming part of an "accumulation of complimentary titles." Language of this latter kind cannot reasonably be looked for in the carefully weighed wording of a solemn decree. Did not then the Church of England formally accept heresy by rejecting the authority of the Pope ; and do not those who assent to her Articles adopt her heretical position ?

With regard to these Articles it is pertinent to observe, that the strenuous efforts made by High Churchmen to vindicate them from formal opposition to the decrees of Trent, on the ground that they were drawn up in substance before the date of those decrees, can only be accounted partially successful ; for their final subscription by Convocation and their legal imposition by Parliament were not until 1571, eight years after the Council had been closed. Briefly their history is as follows : Cranmer's Forty-two Articles of 1552 were mainly derived from the early Lutheran Confessions. They were set aside, of course, in Mary's reign ; but they were reproduced by Parker, as the Thirty-eight, in 1563, the last four having been omitted, while some new clauses were inserted, taken chiefly from the recent Wurtemberg Confession. Accepted

by the Protestant Houses of Convocation, they were laid before the Queen, who, solely on her own authority, omitted the 29th, and added to the 20th the existing introductory clause about the authority of the Church.* Finally, they were re-edited by Jewell, and were enforced by Parliament in their present number and form in 1571. It is clear, therefore, that, where they differ from the teaching of the Church, they are substantially the product of the German heretical movement of the sixteenth century, against which the decrees of Trent were mainly directed ; indeed, in more than one place they precisely contradict the language of those decrees. As instances of their heretical teaching we may notice :—

XI. That we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine.

XIII. Works done before the grace of Christ have the nature of sin.

XIV. Works of supererogation cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety.

XIX. The Church of Rome hath erred . . . in matters of faith.

* On this act of Elizabeth's see Cardwell's "Synodalia," I., 36-41. Speaking of the draft of the Articles before it was submitted to the Queen, he says : "This important document, although attested by the united suffrages of both houses of Convocation, is of no real authority. It has no token of having received the ratification of the Crown, that act of sovereignty, without which the decrees of a Convocation cannot become binding on the Church of England." And then, as to the Queen's interpolation and omission, he adds, "Considering the facts that have been stated, the character of Elizabeth, and the opinions then generally entertained of the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown, we cannot doubt that these alterations were made by the Council [*i.e.*, by laymen], with the concurrence, or more probably at the command, of the Queen, and were probably required by her to be followed in the register of the Convocation. It is evident from several other instances of the exercise of this power, and more especially from a letter of remonstrance addressed to her by Archbishop Grindal at a subsequent period, that she looked upon her supremacy as totally independent, not only of temporal, but also of spiritual, control." *Ecce dii tui, Israel!*

XXI. General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes.

XXII. The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons [Indulgences], Worshipping and Adoration as well of images as of relics, as also invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

XXV. Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel.

XXVIII. Transubstantiation . . . is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith.

XXIX. The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith . . . in no wise are the partakers of Christ [*in the title*, eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper].

XXXI. The sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

XXXVII. The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.

Other passages might be adduced, if not in terms heretical, distinctly savouring of heresy ; but these suffice to show that certain of the Articles were designed to re-

puddate doctrines and practices which at Trent were solemnly affirmed ; and which, moreover, had been for centuries familiar to the Catholics of England, as necessary features in the life and teaching of the Church.

This last point is not without importance ; for there are among High Churchmen those who, while they would reject as not binding the decrees of the Latin Councils since the year 1000, would nevertheless treat with reverence and respect the decrees of national English Synods. And those which from time to time met at Cloveshoe, together with that of London, which in 1382 condemned Wicklyffe, may be specially recommended to their notice ; for a study of their Canons will probably convince them that, if the mediæval Church of England, which was a true and living branch of the Catholic Church, was orthodox in its faith, that "Church of England" to which they themselves belong is distinctly and formally heretical, and cannot therefore claim legitimate spiritual continuity with its predecessor, whose name it bears.

It is perhaps strange that men, who claim to be Catholics, and who as such should be sensitive even to the ill-sounding of opinions which, though not exactly heretical, are yet felt by real Catholics to be "offensive to pious ears," should be able placidly to tolerate in their formularies the presence of such a number of opinions, which, if judged by the "common sense" of Christendom, are distinctly false and alien from the Catholic faith. But, in truth, even the most advanced Anglicans appear unable to appreciate the gravity of heresies which are not directly concerned with the doctrines of the Holy Trinity or of the Incarnation. Provided a man is not professedly an Arian, or a Macedonian, or a Nestorian, or an Eutychian, other doctrinal errors with which he may be infected are but *tolerabiles ineptiæ*. The Church of England only ex-

communicates those who explicitly deny the Divinity of Christ. All others she gladly retains. When some peculiarly offensive opinion is put forth by an Anglican clergyman, High Churchmen meet, protest, petition, memorialise, and so liberate their souls ; but no further step is taken. The teacher of the new heresy, or the denier of the old truth, remains in full communion with men who call themselves Catholics, and profess to hold all Tridentine doctrine. And this goes on time after time until the Church of England becomes a menagerie of discordant opinions. Moreover, year by year Broad Churchmen are ordained, or clergymen before fairly orthodox lapse into Liberalism ; and they do not deny that their hold on dogmatic truth is slender in the extreme. They are the logical followers of men who made the Eucharist into a metaphor, as they do with the Incarnation. To say of them that they are Arians or Nestorians, to hint that they are not explicit in declaring their faith in the co-eternal Son, as true God, and as such equal to the Father, or again in Mary, as the Mother of God, would be to exaggerate their own pretensions to orthodoxy. They will say they acknowledge "the divinity of our Lord ;" but Unitarians make the same profession, he is to them "the revealer of the mind of God," but not the Divine Redeemer, whose Wounds and Precious Blood Catholics adore. Belief in a Supreme Being, and in universal bliss after an indefinite series of periods of probation, imitation of certain parts of Christ's moral teaching, and conformity to the prevailing system of worship,—this is about what constitutes the religious position of a large and increasing number of Anglican clergymen, who belong to the same "Church," are subject to the same "Bishops," and communicate at the same "altars" as the men, the exhibition of whose Catholic sympathies is the occasion of the writing of this Essay.

These last have evidently not realised that, should they clear themselves from heresy, their remaining in voluntary communion with heretics would still condemn their position in the eyes of the Church. Should they explicitly accept every article of the Catholic faith, including the immaculate conception of the Holy Mother of God, and the infallibility of the Pope, they would still stand on a lower platform than those "pure schismatics," who, as is noted above, may perhaps be regarded as members of the Church. They would, on the principles of "antiquity" which they profess, be regarded as implicated in the heresies of the least orthodox of those whom they recognise as members of their own Church. "Anglicans, whatever their faith, can never be regarded as pure schismatics, so long as they remain in habitual communion with notorious heretics, whose Orders they receive, and in whose churches they minister. Scarcely a week passes without the Ritualistic press denouncing many of the English clergy, and sundry of the Bishops, as heretical; but no ecclesiastical action ensues; the orthodox Bishops are silent, and fraternise with their heterodox brethren upon the easy common ground of the English gentleman; whilst the most outspoken of the inferior clergy are satisfied with their outlet in the newspapers, and share altar and pulpit with men whom in their hearts they know to be heretics."* Evidently there has long fled from the Church of England that spirit at once Catholic and Roman, which prompted St. Jerome to cry out to Pope Damasus: "I am joined in communion with your Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter. Upon that Rock I know the Church is built. Whoever outside of this House eats the Lamb is profane. If any one was not in

* "A Critique upon Mr. Ffoulkes' Letter," by H. I. D. Ryder, of the Oratory, p. 45.

the Ark of Noah he shall perish. I know not Vitalis ; I reject Meletius ; I am ignorant of Paulinus. Whoever gathers not with thee, scatters ; that is, he who is not of Christ, is of Antichrist." *

NOTE V. (to p. 24).

Conditional Ordination.

Anglican clergymen, contemplating submission to the Church, have sometimes been disposed to request that, in the event of their taking that step, and of their being accepted for the Catholic Priesthood, the possible validity of their Anglican Orders should be respected by their being re-ordained conditionally ; for they fear that otherwise they may be coöperating in an act of sacrilege.

First, it may be pointed out that, since the Church takes upon herself the responsibility of the whole proceeding, there can by no possibility be any sin in their submitting to her requirements.

And then again, since it is unreasonable to suppose that any Bishop would willingly run the risk of committing a material sacrilege, he may fairly be considered, both in ordaining and confirming, tacitly to intend to administer the Sacrament only to those who are capable of receiving it. And the candidate for Holy Orders also presents himself with the corresponding implied intention.

But probably, they who are disposed to make this stipu-

* On the cause of the absence among High Churchmen, and certainly in the Church of England generally, of that genuine horror of heretical teaching, which is characteristic, not only of the Roman Catholic Church, but (according to their lights) of all sacerdotal communities, see Allies, "St. Peter, his Name and his Office," p. 253

lation have never considered how almost inappreciably what they demand would differ from what is ordinarily done. We will suppose their request is granted. What, nevertheless, is the process to which they must submit, before they can be permitted to say Mass at Catholic altars? First, they are conditionally baptised,* and next unconditionally confirmed, for Anglican confirmation is not recognised as a Sacrament by the Church. Then, if their vocation is considered certain, they receive the tonsure, the four Minor Orders, and the Subdiaconate absolutely, for about all these there is no question. When the Bishop is satisfied that they have sufficient knowledge of dogmatic theology, he ordains them to the Diaconate and Presbyterate *sub conditione*, and finally grants them faculties to hear confessions, if he finds them instructed in, and in other respects fitted for, the duties of directors of souls.

The sole difference, then, would lie in the conditional reception of the two Sacred Orders. And wherein would this difference consist? Probably it would have no outward expression at all; for the Ritual provides no conditional form, save for baptism; and, in any case, in view of the uniform practice of the Church, the doubt in favour of Anglican Orders would be regarded as too slight to call for outward expression in the ceremony. The rites would therefore be followed, precisely as they stand in the Pontifical, and the Bishop would merely in the particular

* Conditionally to baptise all converts from Protestantism in England has been the rule, under directions from Rome, for rather more than a hundred years. But, now that Anglican baptisms are so much more carefully performed, relaxations are permitted when there is evidence producible of the satisfactory character of the act in the particular case. Indeed, if High Churchmen formed a distinct community, it is probable that Rome would never insist on conditional baptism in the case of converts from their ranks. But, as things are, there can be no doubt that it is safer for the rule to be strictly maintained.

cases use the form of ordination with a special but tacit condition.

Is it worth while stipulating for so small a matter, by which nothing is really gained ; especially when, as has been suggested, Sacraments which confer character must always be administered with a general, though perhaps not even mentally expressed, condition ; and when, anyhow, there is nothing to hinder the ordinand from presenting himself with a special condition in his own mind, supposing him to be invincibly prejudiced in favour of his Anglican Orders ?

NOTE VI. (to p. 43).

Anglicanism and Corporate Reunion.

The fact that in earlier periods of the Church's history separated communities possessing valid Orders have been reunited to the Church *en masse*, coupled with the fact that there have been from time to time serious proposals that at least preliminary steps should be taken with the view of ascertaining the possibility of restoring England to Catholic unity by the same means, has had the double effect of making Anglicans even more confident of the validity of their Orders, and of leading them to suppose that it will be by a corporate reconciliation, and not by the submission of individuals to Rome, that the reunion of Christendom will eventually be obtained.

But neither of these conclusions is warranted. The possession of valid Orders is not an indispensable requisite for corporate reunion, though it may go far to facilitate it, since its effect is (as has been already pointed out) to maintain, to a certain extent, internal unity and organisation. Lutheranism does not possess valid Orders ; yet at

one time there was a serious prospect of the corporate return of at least the German Lutherans to the unity of the Church. In the seventeenth century they were influenced by a Catholic revival, corresponding to that which went so far to change the character of Anglicanism at the same period. Bossuet and Spinola on the Catholic side (the latter it is said with the approval of Pope Innocent XI.), made overtures and explanations, which were warmly responded to by Leibnitz and Molanus on behalf of the Protestants. These men accepted fully as much of the Catholic faith as the most advanced Ritualists do now, and they were far more Catholic in spirit.* And, though the negotiations came to nothing, they were for a time quite as hopeful as the similar correspondence between Archbishop Wake and the Doctors of the Sorbonne, or the schemes which the High Church Jacobite Bishops had laid before Panzani at an earlier date. It appears, then, that the negotiations that Catholics have held with Anglicans with a view to corporate reunion are no testimony to the validity of Anglican Orders; though Catholics might freely confess that the retention of at least a nominal Hierarchy in the Church of England would not be without effect in smoothing over the difficulties of reconciliation.

But there is good reason to think that those Anglicans, who talk glibly about the reunion of Christendom, and who attend meetings which are supposed somehow to contribute towards that end, have never really had before them a clear idea of what would be necessary to constitute a "corporate reunion," such as the Catholic Church could be a party to, without compromising any of those principles which are essential to her life.

For first, it may be questioned whether any such scheme

* Leibnitz even desired that the Pope's temporal power should be extended over the whole of Italy.

would be taken into consideration by the Holy See at all, save in the case of the "Church" thus desiring to return to unity being practically co-extensive with some nation or kingdom or province. Perhaps again, it would never be practicable without the coöperation, or at least the formal consent, of the State. And then the really serious difficulties would begin. A full and explicit acceptance of the faith of the Holy Roman Church would be an absolutely essential preliminary; and in this confession would have to be included any doctrines defined since the separation. Such a profession of faith might be made by the Archbishop or Bishops on behalf of the clergy and people; but all would be equally bound by it. And the reunion itself (though some formal and ceremonial act might suffice to publish it with becoming solemnity) would be in fact a slow and complex affair. The Bishops and clergy would have to pass singly through a process of rehabilitation, even if it were allowed that they needed no ordination, conditional or otherwise. Formal claims for a grant of privileges to the "Uniate Church" (*e.g.*, the use of the vernacular in public worship, Communion in both kinds, and permission to the clergy to marry) would need full and patient discussion at Rome.* And finally, the laity could only participate in the act of reunion by obtaining absolution from a priest, whose canonical position was secured by faculties received directly or indirectly from the Holy See.

Are not these considerations enough to show that the notion of a corporate reunion of Anglicanism with "the rest of the Western Church" is utterly chimerical? It is not merely that the vast majority of the Anglican Bishops, clergy, and people, have no wish for any such thing, and

* It is assumed that some such privileges would be demanded, as otherwise there would be no grounds for the formation of an "Uniate Church" at all.

have no thought of believing the Pope's doctrines, or of submitting to his authority ; but that, in fact, the Anglican Church, having no internal unity in faith or discipline—in other words, possessing no *corpus*—is incapable of even entertaining negotiations with a view to such corporate action.

This was not so perhaps a hundred years ago, but it is undeniably the case now ; and it is a fact that daily becomes more apparent. The Protestant principle of private judgment was silenced by its very assertors in the sixteenth century, and was imprisoned by the power of the State. But it is at large everywhere now, except within the Catholic Church, and can never again be set aside except by her. Among Protestants of every denomination it continually asserts itself more vigorously, and that not the least among those who in externals have approached most nearly to Catholicism. The result is that no Protestant Church or sect can any longer act corporately where matters of faith are concerned, except it be to declare an "open question" one after another of the details of the old belief. What Anglican Bishop can now answer for the faith of his clergy, beyond the articles of the Apostles' Creed, if indeed he can answer for all these in any full and definite sense ? And what Anglican clergyman can answer for the faith of his flock ? Has either priest or layman any thought of being bound by the teaching of his ecclesiastical superiors, except so far as it approves itself to his own private judgment ? Even among clergymen who belong to the same party, there are wide divergences of doctrine, and even of principle, which reveal themselves whenever they meet to discuss questions in which theology is concerned. Fuller reference to this peculiarly Anglican characteristic is made in the last but one of these Notes below ; it need not, therefore, be further

insisted upon here, save as witnessing to our assertion that it is vain to anticipate corporate reunion in the case of a Church so utterly devoid of unity within itself. At the very outside, no more than six Anglican Bishops, and six hundred Anglican clergymen, each with an average of (say) a hundred followers, could be induced to unite in proposals for a corporate reunion ; and then nothing could be done until they had formally separated themselves from the communion of their confessedly heretical brethren. This being accomplished, Rome would be called upon to contemplate the formation of an Uniate Church (a most exceptional event in any case), for the benefit of less than a hundred thousand persons, scattered over England, Scotland, the United States and the Colonies, for whose cohesion and perseverance in their allegiance to Rome no one could offer any guarantee ; while a good number of them would be pretty sure to wish to become Roman Catholics out and out, after a brief experience of their privileges as Uniates. Meanwhile, the average Catholic population of an English diocese exceeds the total number of members that this privileged Church could count ; and probably in ten years or so, throughout the district in which the Uniates would be found, as many persons are added to the Church by the ordinary inflow of converts.

It would appear, then, that there are no sufficient grounds for supposing that the future will witness anything that might be called a corporate reunion of the Church of England, or of any considerable fragment of it, with the See of Peter. A mere handful of persons, all more or less "viewy," with no ancient and venerable traditions, with little reverence for authority, and less internal unity, critical, querulous, and officious, pretending to a mission to set straight the whole of Christendom, and themselves held together chiefly by the ties of personal friendship or

of party spirit ;—this is not the material out of which an Uniate Church can be formed. Indeed, under such conditions its very formation would only tend to foster and consolidate in the individuals composing it that un-Catholic spirit which alone seriously hinders them from submission to Rome. Each of them needs, and can obtain only for himself, conversion of the will, and mortification of the private spirit. The Church, they forget, has no need of them, while they have great need of her ; and until they can approach her with reverence and humility, leaving to her the conditions on which they can become her children, and offering themselves to her without *arrière pensée*, and especially without the vain imagination that they are conferring a favour upon her by their act—they have done nothing to warrant them in claiming the Catholic name and privileges. Such conversions take place every day, and all the world over, and they are likely to become more numerous in England in the future. Whole families may thus by united action obtain “corporate reunion” with the living Church ; but no other kind of wholesale return to unity is to be looked for nowadays, either in the case of the Anglican Church, or of any other Christian community formed directly or indirectly by the events of the sixteenth century, for both it and they are daily more and more permeated by the disintegrating spirit of private judgment.

The union, then, of all professing Christians in one fold and under one shepherd can now only be obtained (at least so far as the West is concerned) by the action of individuals ; and they who deliberately defer their submission, dreaming of some corporate action in the future, are simply neglecting to contribute what they can and ought to this most divine work.

NOTE VII. (to p. 111).

The Continuity of the Church of England.

That the existing Established Church of England is in the eye of the civil law the same corporation as that mediæval Church which counted St. Anselm and St. Thomas of Canterbury among her Primates, may be admitted by Catholics without any detriment to their own position. But that it is her legitimate representative, merely changed in certain external features, or, as an Anglican would say, reformed and purified, is a very different assertion, plausible though it may be, and it is one that Catholics cannot allow to pass.

A continuity, no doubt, there was between the Catholic Church of England of the year 1500 and the Elizabethan Church of England of the year 1600, and this continuity was based on some very substantial facts, calculated to give an impression that it was in all important respects real, to those, at least, who do not bear in mind in what the reality of the Church's life consists.

The Elizabethan Church, being nothing more nor less than the religious aspect of the State, inherited without a struggle the buildings, titles, and endowments of Catholic times, which the State had quietly assumed as its own. Moreover, many of the primary articles of the ancient faith were retained, as also certain less significant details of the ancient ritual; and of the laity and inferior clergy the great majority at least externally conformed to the newly established state of things. Allowing all this, is it enough to confirm the Anglican's honest belief that his Church is substantially the same as the ancient Catholic Church of England? On Catholic principles it is not; and that

apart from the question of Orders, the loss of which even High Churchmen (though probably not Low Churchmen) would admit to constitute a breach of continuity. Catholics hold that, even should Orders be retained, a local Church may sever itself from the life of the Body of Christ, probably by heresy or schism alone, and certainly by the two combined. Charity and faith (and not merely the possession of Orders, which is included under the former head) are the bonds which hold the baptised in union with the Catholic Church. Schism is a breach of charity, and heresy is a breach of faith. Where both these cords are deliberately broken, it is surely clear that the continuity of life is lost, though of course it may be recovered by an act of penitence and submission. Where either the Church's unity or the Church's faith is not wilfully (perhaps even unconsciously) departed from, a breach caused by some misunderstanding or jealousy, resulting in a suspension of intercommunion, is more easily healed, and the continuity of the local Church's life need not be held to have been destroyed. But such destruction would certainly ensue if persistence in schism and persistence in heresy came to be (of course in disguise) principles of the local Church's separate existence. It might be difficult to fix an exact date when this act (which may be described as a sort of spiritual suicide) would be consummated; but, whenever it was complete, the "Church" thus separated would cease to deserve the name of "a Church" at all, and would, as such, have no part in the spiritual endowments, privileges, powers and blessings, which belong to the mystical Body of Christ.* We have

* The position is also defensible that a national Church might forfeit its privileges as a true portion of the Catholic Church without any formal acceptance of heresy or schism at all, and certainly without any deliberate rejection of its ancient system of worship. Suppose that some local community, insular in position and spirit, but hitherto in full communion with the Catholic world,

here made the most liberal concessions in the matter of Church membership, and of the continuity of local Churches, that theologians have allowed, either speculatively, or in view of the actual suspensions of intercommunion, the result of political action, or of inchoate heresies and schisms, which, in the early, mediæval, or modern history of the Church, have affected certain districts, great or small, and have prevailed for longer or shorter periods.*

should gradually lapse into great laxities of discipline. The people (we will suppose) become grossly ignorant and superstitious; the priests neglect the service of God, and lead immoral lives; the Bishops omit to make their visits to Rome; they are elected by their clergy, or by the civil power, and, though they send an announcement of their election to the Pope, they are consecrated and proceed to act as Bishops without waiting for his confirmation or recognition; they are members of some prohibited secret society, and combine with the State to resist Apostolic Visitors who are sent by the Holy See to inquire into their conduct. Such a state of things continues for years, and the irregularities grow worse, in spite of counsels, warnings, and threats from Rome. What if the Pope, perceiving the hopelessness of internal reform in a member thus diseased, should finally cut it off, or at least ignore its existence, and send into the district, where it profanes the name of Christ, Vicars-Apostolic and missionary priests, to make converts from the apostate Church, administering to them conditionally all Sacraments they were supposed to have received; and finally should organise this missionary Church as the true Church of the country? Would his act be justly accounted schismatical? By Anglicans it would; and yet their theory can suggest no means by which a country thus unfortunate could be freed from the incubus of its fallen Church. But Catholics would see in such action of the Pope nothing but a legitimate exercise of his supreme power; and, indeed, such a case would witness both to the wholesomeness and to the necessity of that power. Substitute heresy for immorality, and this sketch forms a generous parallel to the position that has been occupied by the Anglican Church. The pharisaical temper of the world can see no evil in heresy, while professing to be shocked at immorality. But the sternness of the Church towards the former, and the gentleness of her dealings with the victims of the latter (provided, of course, that no principle of morality is denied), are but the reflex of the teaching of Christ and his Apostles. And this may serve to explain her long-suffering and patient forbearance in regard to what is said to be the condition of Catholicism in certain districts of Mexico and South America, as contrasted with her severity towards men of exemplary lives, who persist in rejecting one article of her Creed. See the letter in the "Month" for October, 1868, from which an extract is given in Note XII. below.

* The Carmelite theologians of Salamanca, commonly known as the *Sal-manticenses*, support the view that "pure schismatics" do not cease to be members of the Church. They would, however, "unchurch" Anglicans on the

Applied to the case of the Church of England, the principles here appealed to leave no sort of doubt as to what kind of continuity Catholics can allow the Establishment to claim with the ancient English Church. Spiritual and legitimate it is not ; legal (in regard to the action of the civil power), material (in regard to temporal possessions), and nominal (in regard to venerable titles), it may be freely conceded to be. The rejection of the Pope's Supremacy broke the cord of charity ; its transfer to the Crown at least meddled with the cord of faith. But so far this was not irreparable. Schism, however, invariably leads to heresy, and one heresy leads to another. The peculiarly lax Anglican view as to what constitutes serious heresy allows those who hold it to pass with no more than mere protest and censure, heretical opinions which in Catholic eyes are simply condemnatory of the " Church " which tolerates them. Anglicans, however, will admit that a local separated community *might* lapse into such heresies as to reach a point where it would undoubtedly forfeit its claim to be considered " a part of the true Church ; " but, in view of their own position, they tolerate anything short of formal denial of articles of the Creed. Catholics, of course, draw the line much higher, and they point to the heresies formulated in the Anglican Articles, as sufficient to destroy the spiritual continuity of that community which teaches them, or even permits them to be taught. Thus, it appears that material continuity (such as the Established Church can claim), however externally specious, is utterly insignificant in Catholic eyes, when it is not grounded upon charity and faith.

It may be impossible to fix the exact date for the act

ground of heresy. Bellarmine is a representative of the commoner doctrine, that actual communion with the See of Peter is *de constitutivo Ecclesie Christi*. See " A Critique upon Mr. Ffoulkes' Letter," pp. 39-46.

by which the ancient Catholic Church of England terminated its existence as a corporate and organised community ; but it may be safely said that the disintegration was complete within thirty years of the rejection of the Pope's Supremacy, and that thenceforward there was, in the strict sense of the words, no "Church of England" at all, until the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy by Pope Pius IX. in 1851, which made the English Catholics to be truly "a Church" again. Some Catholics, indeed, favour the position that a truly continuous "Church of England" has all along existed in those who have remained faithful to the Catholic religion ; and on that account they are jealous of the retention of certain national characteristics in architecture and ritual, which they think testify to the identity of the modern English Catholic Church with that of the old English Saints. But, in truth, the idea of a local Church, as a true branch of the Catholic Church, implies the existence of Diocesan Bishops, with a regular succession, and of an organised system of government, such as English Catholics had not, so long as they were subject to an Arch-priest or to Vicars-Apostolic ; and, moreover, these national characteristics have not in fact been handed down by any continuous tradition, but are merely the product of an ecclesiastical artistic revival, with which Protestants have had fully as much to do as Catholics ; and they do not therefore possess that significance which is sought to be attached to them. Identity in faith and jurisdiction between the present and the past Catholic Church in England no doubt exists ; but the two Churches differ from one another much as the Church of St. Alban, St. Ninian, St. David, and St. Asaph, differed from the Church of St. Augustine, St. Chad, St. Anselm, and St. Hugh. It is by possessing in Rome a firm *point d'appui*, and an

indefectible source for the renewal of life, that the Catholic Church throughout the world is able again to rise, when, in particular districts, laxity of discipline, a schismatical or heretical spirit, violence and persecution, and even a relentless policy of extermination on the part of the civil power, have weakened or may-be have destroyed the life of this or that local community. Apart from Rome, national Churches are liable to succumb before each and all of these hostile influences ; nor is it easy to see how on Anglican principles they can, when once thus overthrown, be restored. On strict and consistent Anglican principles St. Augustine was just as much a schismatic in the year 600 as was Cardinal Wiseman in 1851, and his landing in England was an impertinence and a wrong ; in short a genuine "Papal aggression."

But, though the existing Catholic Church in England has not (nor needs, on Catholic principles), strict historical continuity with the ancient Church of England, the true Catholic faith has throughout been preserved intact by "a very small remnant," who, when their lawful pastors had either been removed or had apostatised, came under the immediate jurisdiction of the Father of the faithful, and were governed by him through missionary priests and Vicars-Apostolic. Anglicans have striven hard to stigmatise as "Romish schismatics" the valiant little band of Catholics in Elizabeth's reign, who preferred death to forsaking the faith of their fathers. But it is a vain effort ; for the charge can only be sustained by an appeal to a principle of nationalism, alien from the spirit of Christianity. To strengthen (as they imagine), their position, they have asserted that for more than ten years after Parker's consecration no Catholics refused to attend the services of the national Church. But this is incorrect. No doubt, the number of "recusants" was largely increased by the

publication of the Pope's Bull in 1571; but there is evidence that there were not a few who from the first refused to conform;* among them, of course, being the deprived Bishops and clergy; and at what time, or by what act, these men became schismatics, it would be difficult to guess. Certainly, their number was comparatively small; but truth is not ascertained by mere majorities; and if we seek to ascertain the guilt of those thousands who for years remained Catholics at heart, and who longed and prayed for the restoration of the old religion, while they weakly conformed to the new, we must bear in mind that, after Christendom had had the experience of some 1200 years of the union of Church and State, it must have appeared to many utterly incredible that the State's Church, which professed to have Bishops and priests, to be but the purified continuation of that Church in which they had been baptised and educated, and which certainly possessed the dignities, buildings, and endowments of the old religion, was substantially quite a different thing, the State's creation, a sham Church, that could give them no real help in the way of salvation. Moreover, the events of recent years were fresh in their memories—how Edward's Prayer-books had been enforced by Parliament, and by the sword too, and after the lapse of not so many months had been contemptuously thrown aside on Mary's accession. So it might seem wise, or at least expedient, that they should quietly conform and bide their time, until perchance another Mary should ascend the throne, and the new Parliamentary religion should slink into the same limbo as the first. Their very

* Thus, in August, 1562, Cox, the first Protestant Bishop of Ely, writes to Peter Martyr:—"There is everywhere an immense number of Papists, though for the most part concealed; they have been quiet hitherto, except that they are cherishing their errors in their secret assemblies, and willingly shut their ears against the hearing of the word."—"Zurich Letters," First Series, p. 112.

Catholic principles called upon them to obey the law, could they but find it in their consciences to do so. And at least the apostate Church of England had not wandered so far from the old land-marks as had the Protestants abroad ; indeed, in the Queen's chapel and in certain Cathedrals it made a fair show of conservatism. Thus they were tricked into conformity, and by that conformity, sooner or later in the course of Elizabeth's long reign, forgot or renounced their faith.

Happier were they who remained firm from the first, and who kept alive, through fearful odds, the tiny flame of truth ; until such time as the government of the little flock, increased now by conversions, and still more by immigration, should be re-organised, and so its life and unity secured, by the fostering care of him to whom belongs by divine command the supreme office of tending and feeding both lambs and sheep.

NOTE VIII. (to p. 142).

The Catholic Doctrine of Holy Order.

With the view of making clearer what Catholics believe about the Sacrament of Holy Order, and especially about the Priesthood, the following extracts are given from a book entitled "*Instructio pro Sacris Ecclesiæ Ministris*," by the Rev. Aloysius Togni (Rome, 4th edition, 1839), a work of the highest authority, being commonly used in the Roman Seminaries. As it extends over some 350 pages, the few passages here quoted are necessarily incomplete ; but they will serve to convey at least such general knowledge of the Catholic doctrine as to render possible an intelligent apprehension of the theological grounds on which Anglican Orders are called in question.

I.

On the requisites for a valid and lawful reception of Orders.

Quot et quæ sunt dispositiones necessariae ad validam receptionem ordinum ecclesiasticorum?

Sunt tres ; nempè virilis sexus, baptisma susceptum, et voluntas ipsa recipiendi.

Vir non baptizatus estne capax ordinum?

Est incapax : soli quippè Ecclesiæ filii frui debent ejus honoribus ; per baptismum autem homines fiunt filii Ecclesiæ ; et insuper quia baptisma est janua sacramentorum.

Quid intelligitur per illa verba, Voluntas recipiendi ordines?

Intelligitur propositum, quo seriò quis statuit sese ministris Ecclesiæ exterius subicere, atque opus in se impleri quod Ecclesia ipsa veluti sacrum et religiosum celebrare censuit.

Qui neque consentit neque dissentit, sed tantum permittit ordinari, recipitne ordines validè?

Invalidè recepturum censet Benedictus XIV.

Validusne est ordo collatus viro reluctanti?

Nequaquam ; una enim ex conditionibus ad validè recipiendos ordines est intentio etiam suscipientis.

Quæ et quot sunt ea quæ requiruntur ad licitam ordinum receptionem?

Requiruntur præsertim vocatio divina ad statum ecclesiasticum, recta intentio, status gratiæ, character confirmationis, scientia respectivo ordine correspondens, legitima ætas, morum probitas, observatio interstitiorum, ordinatio non facta per saltum, et immunitas à censuris et irregularitate.

Quid est vocatio divina ?

Est actus supernaturalis providentiæ, quo Deus aliquos eligit, eosque præparat consentaneis dotibus ad officia sacra obeunda ; tùm iis inspirat sanctum propositum amplectendi statum ecclesiasticum ad ejus gloriam propriamque sanctificationem.

Necessariæ est hujusmodi vocatio ?

Affirmativè : nemo enim hunc sibi assumere debet honorem, nisi qui vocatur à Deo, tanquam Aaron.

II.

*On Orders in general.**Quid est ordo ?*

Ordo generaliter sumptus significat habitudinem seu relationem prioris et posterioris, vel superioris et inferioris inter plura. Sic in ordine clericali sunt varii ordinum gradus, alii aliis superiores, ordinati ad celebrandum Eucharistiæ Sacramentum. Unde ordo clericalis definitur : Signaculum quoddam Ecclesiæ, quo spiritualis potestas traditur ordinato exercendi ministeria ecclesiastica. Propriè, potestas tradita ordo est ; signaculum autem Ecclesiæ, seu sacra ceremonia, per quam illa confertur, ordinatio dicitur.

Ordo estne verum novæ Legis sacramentum ?

Affirmativè, et est de fide. Concilium enim Tridentinum sic definivit, “ Si quis dixerit ordinem, sive sacram ordinationem, non esse verè et propriè sacramentum à Christo Domino institutum, anathema sit.”

Quot sunt ordines majores, et quot minores ?

Minores sunt quatuor, Ostiariatus, Lectoratus, Exorcistatus, et Acolythatus ; majores sunt tres, nempe Subdiaconatus, Diaconatus, et Sacerdotium, quod comprehendit

Presbyteratum, seu Sacerdotium minus, et Episcopatum, seu Sacerdotium majus, quod Sacerdotii plenitudinem continet.

Quænam requiruntur ad ordines ritè suscipiendos ?

Quædam requiruntur ad *licitam*, quædam ad *validam* ordinum susceptionem. Ad *validam* vero susceptionem, præter ea quæ suprâ dicta sunt, requiritur usus materiæ, prolatio formæ, ac intentio dantis et susipientis.

Quid est intentio tam dantis quam susipientis ?

Est actus voluntatis quo ordinans vel actualiter vel virtualiter facere proponit quod in collatione illius ordinis facit Ecclesia, et quo ordinandus intendit recipere ordinationem illam.

Cùm ordo sit sacramentum, debet producere suos effectus
Quinam ergo sunt effectus ordinis ?

Sunt augmentum gratiæ sanctificantis, ut ordinatus in se sanctus sit ; gratia sacramentalis, ut quis fiat idoneus minister ; et character.

Quid est gratia sanctificans ?

Est donum Dei reddens animam amicam Dei et paradisi hæredem.

Quid est gratia sacramentalis ?

Sunt quædam auxilia quæ ordinato conferuntur, ut ritè exerceat officium proprium ordinis recepti.

Quid est character ?

Est signum spirituale indelebile, impressum in animâ, per quod ordinati à cæteris fidelibus distinguuntur, et divino ministerio dedicantur.*

* This definition of *character* appears to have been purposely left vague, so that it might be applicable to the case of all the Orders. A fuller account of the special character conferred in priestly ordination will be found above, p. 120.

III.

*On the Priesthood.**Quid est Presbyteratus?*

Est sacramentum novæ Legis à Christo Domino institutum, quo duplex spiritualis potestas ordinato traditur, quarum unum respicit Corpus Christi *reale*, nempe transubstantiandi panem et vinum in Corpus et Sanguinem Christi; altera respicit Corpus Christi *mysticum*, nempe remittendi et retinendi peccata fidelium.

Quænam est materia Presbyteratus?

Diversæ sunt hæc super re sententiæ theologorum. Ac prima quidem eam collocat in solâ manuum impositione; altera in solâ instrumentorum porrectione, calicis nempe cum vino, et patenæ cum hostiâ; tertia inter ambas media collocat in utrâque.

Quænam ex his sentiis probabilior est?

Probabilior, et certè in praxi sequenda tertia videtur, quæ manuum impositioni addit porrectionem instrumentorum, ita ut hæc apud Latinos saltem partialis materiæ vices habeat, seu ad materiæ integritatem pertineat.

Quomodo probatur manuum impositionem materiam esse Presbyteratus?

Multis id evincitur argumentis. Nam (1) ab Apostolorum temporibus usque in præsens ubique gentium adhibita est manuum impositio in Presbyteris ordinandis; ipsique a Patribus et Conciliis adscripta est gratiæ productio. (2) Ante annum millesimum in ordinatione Presbyterorum non erat in usu instrumentorum traditio; de eâ enim nulla mentio fit in Conciliis neque in Ritualibus illorum temporum. (3) Traditio calicis et patenæ numquam fuit in usu nec modò est in Ecclesiis Orientalibus, sed sola manuum impositio; horum tamen ordinationes admittit et probat sancta Romana Ecclesia.

Quomodo probas porrectionem instrumentorum apud Latinos saltem partialis materiæ vices habere, seu ad materiæ integritatem pertinere?

Quia Eugenius IV. in decreto pro instructione Armenorum docet Presbyteratus materiam esse traditionem calicis cum vino et patenæ cum hostiâ ; unde gravissimi theologi inferunt traditionem hujusmodi instrumentorum esse saltem materiam partialem ordinationis sacerdotalis, seu ad materiæ integritatem pertinere. Censent nimirum Christum materias et formas sacrarum ordinationum sic instituisse ut ex Ecclesiæ institutione et usu speciale aliquid præ materiâ et formâ addi posset, cujus omissio ordinationem irritam redderet.

Quare Eugenius IV. in decreto præ instructione Armenorum memorat tantum porrectionem instrumentorum, silet de manus impositione.

Quia ipsi propositum erat Armenos docere ritus Ecclesiæ Romanæ ; ac proinde illis tradere debuit solam materiam integrantem quâ ipsi non utebantur ; non autem manus impositionem quam ipsi adhibebant simul cum Latinis et omnibus Orientalibus.

Quotuplex manus impositio distingui potest in Presbyteri ordinatione?

Triplex ; prima quæ silentio fit ; secunda cui adjungitur oratio ; tertia post communionem in quâ dicitur, “ Accipe Spiritum Sanctum ; quorum remiseras peccata remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueris retenta sunt.”

Quænam ex istis est materia essentialis Presbyteratus?

Postrema non videtur essentialis, quia non est in usu apud Orientales Ecclesias, nec semper in usu fuit apud Latinos ; nam usque ad undecimum sæculum nec in Conciliis nec in ritualibus libris ulla fit de eâ mentio. Accedit quod ista jam supponit hominem Sacerdotem institutum, aliter non potuisset in ipsâ Missâ ordinationis validè con-

secrare cum Episcopo Corpus et Sanguinem Christi. Prima autem manus impositio, si à secundâ dividatur, essentialis non est, quia nullam habet formam adjunctam, quod tamen requiritur in Sacramentis conficiendis, juxtâ illud Augustini, “Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit Sacramentum.” Super hæc, ea est Orientalibus ignota, nec in antiquis Ritualibus reperitur. Unde solum essentialis est secunda manus impositio, quæ tamen haberi potest veluti continuatio primæ. Attamen in praxi etiam postrema esset supplenda si fuerit omissa.

Quænam est forma Presbyteratus?

Duplex est; nempe oratio per quam Episcopus invocat Spiritum Sanctum in eos quibus manus imponit, et super quos orando manum detinet extensam; itemque verba quæ profert Episcopus cum tangenda tradit cuilibet ordinando calicem cum vino et aquâ et patenam superimpositam cum hostiâ, singulis dicens, “Accipe potestatem offerendi Sacrificium Deo, Missasque celebrandi tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis. In nomine Domini.”

Quodnam est discrimen Presbyterum inter et Episcopum?

Episcopus jure divino superior est Presbytero tum potestate ordinis tum jurisdictione. Potestate ordinis, nam administrat Sacramenta Ordinis et Confirmationis, circa quæ reliqui inferioris ordinis, adeoque etiam Presbyteri, “potestatem nullam habent” inquit Tridentinum: jurisdictione etiam, nam Episcopus hanc propriam et ordinariam habet per totam diocesim; Presbyter verò vel habet vicariam tantum et delegatam, vel ordinariam, sed tantum in quâdam dioceseseos parte. Unde Episcopatus est Sacerdotii apex et complementum, primum locum obtinens in hierarchiâ ecclesiasticâ.

Quænam sunt Presbyterorum officia?

Presbyterorum officia describit Pontificale Romanum

in quo sic legitur : “ Sacerdotem oportet offerre, benedicere, præesse, prædicare, et baptizare.”

Possuntne hæc omnia fieri a quolibet sacerdote?

Minimè ; non enim omnibus et singulis assignatur populus quem regant, et cui in rebus spiritualibus præesse debeant. Ordinatio jus præbet Presbyteris ut Missæ Sacrificium offerant, eucharisticum Panem populo distribuant, et quasdam dent benedictiones ; in quo servandi sunt ritus et consuetudines Ecclesiæ ; ex quibus quædam benedictiones Episcopis, quædam Parochis, quædam aliis ab Episcopo delegatis Presbyteris reservantur ; aliæ autem minus solemnes sunt, quas Presbyteri quique impertiri possunt. Quantùm ad alia tria munia supradicta, Presbyteri per ordinationem tantum idonei fiunt ad ipsa exercenda, ex commissione et jurisdictione obtentâ.

Explica melius et distinctius Presbyterorum officia.

Officium Presbyterorum est Missam celebrare, et à peccatis absolvere, acceptâ ab Episcopo facultate potestatem hanc exercendi ; solo excepto mortis articulo, in quo Ecclesia liberam Presbytero cuivis in morientem attribuit potestatem dimittendi peccata. Insuper possunt Presbyteri de licentiâ Parochi solemniter baptizare, extremam Uncionem præbere, viaticum administrare, matrimonia jungere ac benedicere. Demùm, quantùm ad ea munera quæ Pontificale designat per verba *præesse et prædicare*, nempe fidelem populum regere, et verbum Dei annuntiare, aptus quidem et idoneus fit quisque Presbyter per ordinationem ad illa exercenda ; sed cùm habeant respectum ad populum, et sint exercitium spiritualis in eum jurisdictionis et potestatis, hinc sine Episcopi facultate non potest Presbyter potestate uti eorum munerum exercendorum, quam accepit in ordinatione.

NOTE IX. (to p. 192).

The Significance of the Ornaments Rubric.

It will be well to estimate, in connection with the rubrical directions of Edward's First Prayer-book, the value of the testimony borne to the sacerdotal character of the Anglican Ministry by what is termed the "Ornaments Rubric." In the opinion of some High Churchmen, by authorising the use of special vestments at the Eucharistic celebration, it makes good the admitted lack of witness to the sacrificial character of the rite in the language of the Communion Service itself. But this is clearly putting too much upon a single sentence, which itself stands sorely in need of interpretation. Its very origin is doubtful ; it was not contained in the Elizabethan Prayer-book as it left the hands of the revisers, and it appears to have been inserted by the Queen and her Council with the political aim of breaking the change of religion. Whatever its meaning may be (it is said to bear five distinct explanations), it is certain that no service-book ever contained a more singular rubrical direction ; and its obscurity, as all the world knows, has given rise to endless controversy and to costly litigation. Our judgment on the value of its testimony to the validity of Anglican Orders will be best made clear by an illustration.

An Anglican clergyman, say in the year 1870, is anxious to learn what official dress he ought to wear when he administers the Lord's Supper. Did he look at the matter with Catholic eyes, he need have no perplexity ; for usage to which authority consents is a safe guide ; and a rubric, the non-observance of which during some forty years the Bishops unanimously, though tacitly, condone, is, on

Catholic principles, to be regarded as obsolete ; much more, therefore, one which has by common consent been a dead letter for three centuries. But our friend's mind was not cast in this mould ; he is anxious to make some change, not perhaps for its own sake, but with the view of arousing his people, if possible, from the spiritual lethargy which seems to overwhelm them so soon as they enter his Church. He hears that a neighbouring clergyman has worked wonders in this way, by combining the use of a patent surplice-chasuble with energetic preaching of Methodist doctrines. Can he not himself, on the plea of authority, introduce some attractive novelty, that may increase and enliven his congregation ? The rubrics prefixed to the Communion Service give him no help, for they are silent as to the costume of the administrator ; but there is a direction at the beginning of the Prayer-book, the "Ornaments Rubric," which refers him to what was worn by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI.—a somewhat circuitous method, as he might reasonably complain, of indicating what a dozen words would have made clear. He turns, however, to his history, to ascertain the period which is to be his guide, and is further perplexed to find that, as Edward's second year ended on January 28th, 1549, nearly five months before the Prayer-book was enforced by law, Parliament did not actually authorise the wearing of any particular dresses until the third year had begun ; and that, in fact, chasubles, together with all the rest of the Catholic ornaments, were commonly worn in Edward's second year, not by the authority of Parliament, but by the prescription of a yet unbroken tradition. For the moment, therefore, he is baffled in his laudable anxiety to conform to the Anglican liturgy ; but happily he learns from a letter to the "Guardian"

that the rubric in question is not now worded exactly as it was in Elizabeth's Prayer-book. So he hastens to procure a copy of this work, in spite of its rarity and cost; and, when it has been obtained, he is gratified to find that the Act of Parliament, which is to be his guide, is "prefixed to this book." It proves to be the Act which enforced the Prayer-book of 1549; and, since it was passed before Edward's second year had expired, and was at once voluntarily accepted by the Reforming party at Court, he sees that the language of the existing rubric is just reconcilable with his making the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. his ritual guide, at least in the matter of ecclesiastical vesture. A copy of this last has now to be obtained; and here he has less difficulty; for, being more to the taste of High Churchmen than Elizabeth's book, it has been several times reprinted. He reads its rubrics with satisfaction, and is on the point of ordering "full sets of Mass vestments" in all colours, which he learns from an advertisement in the "Church Times" he can obtain in "Italian cloth" (evidently a peculiarly "correct" material), at a very moderate cost. But a few moments of reflection induce him to pause. After all (the Bishop's advice being, of course, out of the question), the rubrics, and not the ecclesiastical tailor, must be his guide. And here a question of interpretation perplexes him. What is "a vestment or cope?" Is the second term merely explanatory of the first, or is an alternative intended? And then, again, if the latter interpretation be correct, and two distinct things are meant, how is he to be sure that "a vestment" stands for "chasuble, stole and maniple," as a writer to another "religious journal" asserts, and as the tailor is prepared to concede? Why, he may ask, if they are all to be worn, are they not all specified, as they were in the ancient rubrics? And, allowing that "vestment"

may include all the rest, on what authority will he be able to dissociate the stole from the chasuble, so as to wear it with his surplice alone, which is all that he expects his people will be able to stand at first? And then, further, what significance is he to teach them to attach to "a vestment," whatever it may be, if he has to confess, as he must, if he honestly tells the whole truth, that a cope, which he finds has not the same significance as a chasuble, may be substituted for it at will? These reflections lead him to suspect that he might, after a while, find it difficult to defend the changes he proposes to make; and so, after seriously reconsidering the whole matter, he concludes that the question of usage ought not to be left out of sight; and he inquires what in practice has been the interpretation put upon the "Ornaments Rubric" from 1559 onwards. And he finds that from the first it has been absolutely a dead letter, so far, at least, as those who like himself, were in Anglican Orders, are concerned. Surplice and hood have in the course of three centuries obtained by common and recognised use that lawfulness which alb with vestment or cope have lost through equally recognised disuse. So that, in the end he determines that, whatever temporary advantage there might have been in the introduction of some fashionable novelty, his most prudent course will be quietly to conform to the tradition which he has inherited, and to venture on nothing more than what everywhere obtains the tacit approval of the whole Anglican Episcopate. And the wisdom of this resolution is abundantly justified when, a few years later, he reads of a brother-clergyman being visited with heavy penalties, for obstinately clinging to that private interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, which he was himself once tempted to accept.

In truth, very little can be made of this now famous

direction. As a rubric it is grotesque ; and since, at the utmost, it only concedes "a vestment" as an alternative for a cope, it bears no real testimony to there being anything sacrificial in the Anglican Communion Service. It appears to have been inserted tentatively in 1559. At that date it was doubtful how much Protestantism the elder conforming clergy might be induced to accept ; and for their sake Elizabeth desired thus to leave a loophole for the retention of a good deal of Catholic ceremonial, should such a course be found for the time expedient. But it soon became clear that the tide was setting strongly in the Puritan direction ; and, whatever may be the precise legal force of the Elizabethan "Advertisements" of 1566, it is certain that they were intended practically to override the rubric, and to insist on the surplice in parish churches, and on the cope in Cathedrals, when there was good reason to anticipate that soon nothing but the Geneva gown would anywhere be tolerated by the daily more powerful leaders of the Protestant party.*

The Jacobite and Caroline High Church revisers, in 1604 and 1661 respectively, desired no doubt to "retain," anyhow as an ideal, what might serve to give dignity to their hierarchical pretensions ; but that they contemplated the use of stoles or chasubles, or indeed of any ecclesiastical ornaments more significant than copes, is at least exceedingly doubtful, and is not in harmony with what is known

* Thus Jewell, the first Protestant Bishop of Salisbury and the earliest champion of the Anglican system, writes to Peter Martyr in February, 1562:—"I know that all changes of importance in the State are offensive and disagreeable, and that many things are often tolerated by sovereigns by reason of the times. And this at first probably was not attended by inconvenience ; but, now that the full light of the Gospel has shone forth, the very vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed together with the rubbish, and, as the saying is, with the very dust. And I wish we could effect this in respect to that linen surplice ; for as to matters of doctrine we have pared everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth."—"Zurich Letters," First Series, p. 100.

of their views on the Eucharistic rite. And they had to exercise no little ingenuity, not to say craft, in order to maintain the position of the rubric even as a dead letter (for there was no pretence made of enforcing it); and, in so doing, the men of 1661 may be said to have laid a train, which, after the lapse of rather more than two hundred years, should explode the Church of England.

NOTE X. (to p. 211).

Anglican Jurisdiction.

As reference has been made above to the lack of legitimate jurisdiction within the Anglican Church, the want which, on Catholic principles, renders unlawful all exercise of Anglican Orders, be they ever so valid, and nullifies all Anglican absolutions as such—it may be well to append a few words on this subject, though a full discussion of the numerous questions involved is in this place neither possible nor necessary.*

Three things are needed to secure the position of a Christian minister—viz., Vocation, Ordination, and Mission. The first is originally internal, but it requires external recognition by the Bishop in the name of the Church; the last two are externally conferred, by the Sacrament of Holy Order, and by the grant of jurisdiction respectively. The necessity of an interior vocation is admitted by ordinary Protestants; but with them ordination is little more than a formal recognition of the “call.” High Churchmen contend for the absolute need of ordination, as

* Mr. E. H. Thompson's little treatise on “The Unity of the Episcopate” is especially recommended to those who wish to obtain a clear idea of the modern Catholic doctrine, and of its identity with the teaching of the Fathers.

a sacramental act ; but we venture to assert that only within the Catholic Church are all three requirements fully met both in theory and practice.*

We are not here concerned with Vocation. All are agreed as to its necessity, though may-be the Prayer-book doctrine on the subject is not free from Protestant error. And there is some little reason to think that there are among the Anglican clergy not a few who have a true vocation to the Priesthood ; though whether in their present position they have been able to follow it out is another matter. Nor in this place have we to do with Ordination. The scope of our Essay has been to question its substantial existence in the Church of England ; but here, for the sake of argument, it may be allowed. In this Note our aim is briefly to indicate those Catholic principles concerning Mission, which involve the conclusion that, even though Anglican Orders be valid, they cannot be lawfully exercised for lack of canonical jurisdiction.

That the spiritual power of Order needs to be supplemented by the spiritual power of Jurisdiction, so as to prevent the use of the former from lapsing into anarchy, through the indiscriminate exercise of its tremendous functions by those who are possessed of them when and where they will, is so clearly the teaching of common sense as well as of the Catholic Church, that there can be no need to insist upon it. So far as Order by itself is concerned, Bishops do not differ very much from priests, and all Bishops are equal ; so that, if the power of jurisdiction did not exist, there would be nothing left but the chance of mutual agreement to prevent the Church from

* Similarly it may be said that ordinary Protestants mean by "the Church" the representative of Christ as Prophet ; High Churchmen his representative as Prophet and Priest ; but only Catholics see in the Church, Christ present as Prophet, Priest, and King.

dissolving at once into chaos ; indeed, without the divine endowment of jurisdiction her unity could not have lasted even from Ascension Day until Pentecost. But those who distinguish between Bishops and Archbishops, as Anglicans do, have already admitted the existence of such a power, as something apart from Order ; we need therefore only attempt to ascertain wherein it consists, and where it is legitimately seated.

The regal office of Christ is reflected in the Church's jurisdiction, just as his sacerdotal office is in her worship, and his prophetic office in her doctrine. Jurisdiction, then, is a prerogative of the Church, which she has received from God, and is no mere concession which has been made to her by the world in the days of her temporal wealth ; nor such, therefore, as can be withdrawn from her. Her power of self-government belongs to her of divine right, and can only be destroyed by what would be (if it were possible) her own destruction. At certain times and in certain places the Church has, no doubt, permitted Christian governments to coöperate with her in her external rule ; but in so doing she has not forfeited her right of resuming exclusively her full powers, should governments not really Christian attempt to claim rights over her, which she has not granted them.

But, while Catholics hold that the power of spiritual jurisdiction was in its fullest extent granted by Christ to St. Peter and the other Apostles, as to a corporate body or College, and through them to their successors, they do not deny that, like all other endowments of the living Church, it has been subject to a process of development, such as might lead the superficial observer to conclude that the system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which he sees at work in the Catholic Church to-day, is a different thing from that authority which Christ bequeathed to those

whom he left in the world to represent him. The use of technical language, and the minute regulation to which the exercise of jurisdiction has in process of time been necessarily subjected, might suggest that some such change had taken place; but they no more indicate that the modern Catholic system is a "corruption" of primitive ecclesiastical authority, than the theological language of the Athanasian Creed proves it to be a corruption of the original Evangelical doctrine. Anglicans, who cannot logically hold their ground against the principles of ordinary Protestant theology, without accepting some very substantial theory of development in doctrine, should be the last persons to object to a corresponding development in discipline, which from the nature of the case must be even more subject to such a process.

Catholics, then, admit that many of the external features of the modern Church's jurisdiction are what they are through their having participated in the Church's life; but they deny altogether that her authority has undergone any essential change. They hold that the Primacy of jurisdiction now exercised by his Holiness Pope Leo XIII. was granted by Christ to St. Peter whole and entire, when He gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and bade him tend His sheep as well as feed both sheep and lambs. The other Apostles, indeed, received all the powers of Order that St. Peter received, and they were also entrusted with the office to bind and loose, though at a later time and in less significant terms than he. But St. Peter's prominence throughout the history in the Gospels and Acts (which cannot here be drawn out in detail), witnesses to the Catholic doctrine, that what was conferred upon the eleven, they did not receive as independent individuals, but as an organised body, united under Peter their Prince. All the Apostles had universal jurisdiction, and all had,

moreover, privileges which no successor of St. Peter has enjoyed. They were, at least in their dogmatic writings, and probably in their public preaching, infallible by special inspiration ; and they are commonly held to have been after Pentecost impeccable, so far at least as mortal sin is concerned.

But their exceptional position in no way interferes with the privilege of Peter and of his successors. After he had sealed his teaching in Rome by the blood of that martyrdom, which, in view of its peculiar witness to the providentially ordered centre of the Catholic Church, his Lord had distinctly foretold, but while St. John was still living at Ephesus, it is to Pope St. Clement, and not to the Apostle and Evangelist, that the Corinthian Christians instinctively turned for guidance in the disorders which afflicted them ;* and this is but the first of that long chain of witnesses to the Primacy of jurisdiction inherent in the Roman See, which is furnished both by East and West as the early centuries elapse. Councils do not confer this Primacy ; they assent to it as a fact, either grudgingly or generously, according to the temper of those who composed them ; nor do Popes assert it as an object of ambition ; they insist upon the justice of their privilege, as of divine right, in spite of confessions of personal unworthiness ; or, if they neglect to urge their claim, it

* It is noteworthy that the recently discovered fragments of St. Clement, which Dr. Lightfoot has edited, furnish additional testimony to the supremacy of Rome. The editor observes that by means of them "we are enabled to understand more fully the secret of Papal domination ;" and he adds, "It may seem strange to describe this noble remonstrance as the first step towards Papal aggression ; and yet undoubtedly this is the case." He endeavours to set aside the force of the passages by insisting that it is in the name of the Roman Church, and not in that of the Roman Bishop, that the letter is addressed to the Corinthians. But, in fact, the Roman Church is "the mother and mistress of all Churches" simply and solely because her Bishop, as the successor of St. Peter, is the Vicar of Christ.

is in proportion to their lack of correspondence to the graces which they receive in their high vocation.

Such, then, is a brief sketch of the doctrine of the Papal Primacy, which was defined with some fulness, though not for the first time, by the Vatican Council, and on which the unity of jurisdiction within the Church has from the first depended. That it has been at all periods and in all parts of the Church realised with that precision with which it is now, no Catholic pretends. Indeed, it is beyond question that the Oriental Apostolic Sees, and even the Patriarchate of Constantinople more than any of them, though it could claim no Apostle as its founder, and had no preëminence save such as Councils conferred on it in consequence of the secular dignity of the city—for centuries acted in matters in which jurisdiction was concerned with a freedom which seemed to imply their independence of the See of Rome. Yet the interference of Popes in the affairs of the East, and the continual application of Oriental Patriarchs for confirmation of their election from Rome, are evidence that this independence was not real, but was no more than a tacit concession, that could work no harm to the Church so long as the privilege of Peter was respected.* In course of time, however, jealousy of the Pope's preëminence led to questionings of the uniqueness of his position, and then the freedom which the East had possessed contributed not

* The concession, whether tacit or formally granted, by which Patriarchal or important Archiepiscopal Sees became, as it were, reservoirs of jurisdiction, so that their suffragan Bishops were commonly elected without direct reference to Rome, can be illustrated in the West as well as in the East. Venice, Salzburg, and Canterbury, to give no other instances, at one time or another enjoyed this privilege, which perhaps some distant provinces and missionary Bishops still retain. The union of the Patriarch, Archbishop, or Vicar Apostolic with the Holy See guarantees the legitimate jurisdiction of those whom he confirms and consecrates. But modern facilities of communication continually lessen the need for any such privileges.

a little to its separation from Rome ; very much as in France at a later date insistence on " Gallican liberties " led to the Jansenist schism. But, without going further into the question of the Papal origin of all spiritual jurisdiction, it is enough to say that Scripture, tradition, and reason sufficiently prove the justice of the Catholic doctrine to those who, without belonging to the Church themselves, are not invincibly prejudiced against her.

Next we proceed to inquire what replies are commonly made by Anglicans to the objections against the legitimacy of their position, which flow from the Catholic doctrine of jurisdiction. The ordinary Anglican attitude in this matter, necessitated by the events of the sixteenth century, and maintained continuously since then by all save the High Church party, has been to deny the very existence of spiritual jurisdiction as a power apart from Order, and yet inalienable from the Church. All jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, was ascribed to the Christian State. And, in particular, the upholders of this view denied the legitimacy of the Pope's jurisdiction in England ; they condemned it as an usurpation, and maintained that at the time of the Reformation it had been rightly transferred to the Crown. The Royal Supremacy was thus admitted to extend over the ground formerly claimed by the Popes. This is Hooker's doctrine. He says, " This power [of universal jurisdiction] being some time in the Bishop of Rome, who by sinister practices had drawn it into his hands, was for just considerations by public consent annexed unto the King's royal seat and crown." And then a little later :—" When in any part of the Church errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities are grown, which men in their several jurisdictions either do not or cannot help ; whatsoever any spiritual authority or power (such as Legates from the See of Rome would

exercise) hath done or might heretofore have done for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort, . . . as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the King for ever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work, . . . but by commissioners few or many, who, having the King's letters patent, may, on the virtue thereof, execute the premises as agents, in the right, not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his supereminent power."*

There is no mistaking such language as this. Hooker, as the recognised exponent of the Anglican system, clearly attributed to the Crown what had to pass for spiritual jurisdiction. He did not attribute to it the power of Order, certainly. Henry VIII. had logically claimed his right to this as well; but Elizabeth did not venture so far; and the thirty-seventh Article repudiated the claim. The Anglican doctrine, then, appears to be that, while ordination and consecration qualify men for the positions of priest and Bishop, the authority to act as such in this or that diocese or parish comes to the Bishop directly from the Crown, and to the priest indirectly through his Bishop. And this view is at least consistent with the history of the Anglican Church, and gives a reasonable account of the prominent part the State has played in Anglican ecclesiastical matters.† Elizabeth supplied to "Parker's consecrators," if not Episcopal character, at least their

* "Ecclesiastical Polity," Book VIII., cap. viii. § 4.

† It is also the only reasonable explanation of the Oath or Declaration now taken or made by every Anglican Bishop when he does homage to the Sovereign, which is as follows:—"I do verily testify and declare that your Majesty is the only Supreme Governor of this your Realm in spiritual and ecclesiastical things as well as in temporal, and that no foreign prelate or potentate has any jurisdiction within this Realm; and I do acknowledge and confess to have and hold the Bishopric of N., and the possessions of the same entirely, as well the spiritualities as the temporalities thereof, only of your Majesty, and of the Imperial Crown of this your Majesty's Realm. And for the same possessions I do my homage presently to your Majesty. So help me God and by the holy contents of this Book." It is difficult to see how

authority to act as Bishops ; she suspended Archbishop Grindal, Parker's successor, on account of his tenderness towards the Puritans ; and the other Bishops, who petitioned her to remove the suspension, piteously addressed her as *nos, quos Ecclesiæ gubernationi præfecisti*. Charles I. by his "supreme royal and ecclesiastical authority" released Archbishop Abbot from the irregularity he had incurred by having accidentally killed a man out hunting ; and at a later date he suspended him in the mode that Hooker had suggested,—*i.e.*, through a commission. Similarly, Archbishop Sancroft was suspended on the accession of William of Orange ; and, with the exception of a handful of Non-jurors, all the Anglican Bishops and clergy acknowledged that Calvinistic Prince as supreme Governor of their Church. Nor has the Royal Supremacy become inactive in our own day ; though Parliament and the Cabinet Ministry have quietly slipped into the Sovereign's place. The suppression of Irish Bishoprics, the erection of new Sees in England, the appointment of new Courts, whether of the first instance or of appeal, for the trial of cases of heresy and of ecclesiastical discipline—all these acts, and such as these, though first of all protested against, but in no long time accepted, are not justly stigmatised as encroachments of the State, or as the establishment of a new jurisdiction ; they are

this strongly-worded Declaration can be taken to mean less than that the Sovereign of England claims to be the sole source of spiritual jurisdiction within the Established Church. Anglicans have protested, and with justice, that the power of Order is not included in the terms of the oath ; but this Catholics do not assert, having plenty of good reasons for believing that Anglican Bishops have received no genuine power of Order from any other source. And of course a controversy may be raised as to the precise meaning of the "spiritual things" over which the Queen is supreme ; whether, for instance, it constitutes her the final judge of doctrine. But the fact will still remain that the Declaration, in its plain and obvious sense, is to the last degree Erastian ; and it may be confidently asserted that there is not a Catholic Bishop in the world who would not suffer imprisonment, torture, and death, rather than make it.

but illustrations of the fatal truth that the Anglican Church, as such, and apart from the State, has no spiritual jurisdiction at all, and has had none since the establishment of the Elizabethan Hierarchy. Since that date no Anglican Bishop has had the power to judge *in foro externo* save as the representative of the Sovereign ; and the other jurisdiction *in foro conscientie* has, of course, been lost by the abolition of the Sacrament of Penance. The Anglican Ministry, therefore, however validly ordained, has but a purely civil jurisdiction ; and even this it will lose by disestablishment. As things are, the clergy of the Church of England have a kind of mission to all the people of the land, and to all British subjects, whether at home or abroad ; but this mission is theirs as servants of the State. Orders do not send, but only qualify a man to be sent ; and a true priest, whose faith and morals are beyond suspicion, acts schismatically, if he exercises his Orders without the permission of the Bishop directly or indirectly received—*i.e.*, without a grant of legitimate jurisdiction.

Of course High Churchmen will not admit this estimate of the Anglican position, in spite of the overwhelming strength of evidence by which it can be supported. Since the rise of Tractarianism there have been those who have strenuously denied the very existence of the Royal Supremacy. Latterly, however, some of the more outspoken among the Ritualists have confessed that the spiritual jurisdiction of their Church is at least “in abeyance ;” but there have been others who have maintained that the Church of England still possesses it to the full ; and they have compared the action of the State in Anglican ecclesiastical matters with what in Catholic countries, in the Middle Ages especially, the secular power, by concession of the Church, did in regard to some of the details of her external government. But, in truth, if the cases are examined,

there will be found to be no real parallel between them. They differ, not merely in degree, but in kind. That Catholic sovereigns have at times encroached upon the domain of ecclesiastical government to an extent that has proved detrimental to the Church's highest interests, is undoubted; but even in their most tyrannical moods they never dreamed of claiming to be the source of spiritual jurisdiction within their realms, or the supreme judges of doctrine; which has been and is the position in regard to the Anglican Church occupied by the English sovereigns from Elizabeth to Victoria.

They, however, who maintain that the Church of England has true spiritual jurisdiction, independently of the civil power, have put forth two theories as to the channel in which it flows; but neither of them can be maintained, when principles that have any claim to be styled Catholic are accepted.

The one is, that jurisdiction is part and parcel of the Apostolical Succession, in the sense that it is given together with ordination and consecration. It has already been pointed out that this attempted fusion of two distinct spiritual powers into one can only end in confusion; and it is, moreover, incorrect to say that the Sacrament of Holy Order confers jurisdiction. It is granted by legitimate election and confirmation, and no Sacrament has properly anything to do with it.* A layman, lawfully elected a

* Of course it is not denied that in early times, before the Church began to exercise her various powers with that detailed formality which she has now used for (say) a thousand years, the consecration of a Bishop practically included the confirmation of his election, and so conferred jurisdiction upon him. Our argument, however, has to do with the practice in England in the sixteenth century; and in the Anglican Church the confirmation has always been a separate act from the consecration. The question, therefore, is simply what kind of jurisdiction can we take the Catholic and Anglican confirmations respectively to have conferred; Parker's confirmation on December 9th, 1559, being regarded as the source of all subsequent jurisdiction within the Anglican Church.

Bishop, may at once exercise all exterior acts of Episcopal jurisdiction ; whereas a Bishop, who has been lawfully deposed, or whose resignation has been duly accepted, cannot so much as give absolution without receiving fresh faculties. Wherein lawful election consists is not perhaps so easily stated, for it may vary and has varied at different times and in different places ; but it is clear that, wherever there is an established custom, it cannot be lightly set aside without imperilling the validity of the election ; and that, if occasion should arise necessitating a departure from the ordinary procedure, recognition of the person elected by those whom the act concerns, whether they be superiors, subjects or compeers, is needed to render his position secure.* Some such principles as these may be used to ascertain the validity of the election of certain Popes ; but they would be fatal to the notion that the election of Parker by command of the Queen, and his subsequent confirmation by Barlow and the others, who afterwards consecrated him, were sufficient to invest him with true spiritual jurisdiction ; for they themselves were not at the time possessed of any lawful jurisdiction ; and of course Parker's election obtained no confirmation or recognition from the Pope, or from those Bishops who were still in canonical possession of the suffragan Sees of the province of Canterbury, though deprived by Parliament. And Barlow and the others expressly stated that they derived from the Crown the authority by which they confirmed him. Their own words were, " We confirm the election of the venerable man† Mr. Matthew Parker by the supreme authority of the

* It should not be forgotten that it is not necessarily by election, but ordinarily by confirmation of the election made, that the Pope grants jurisdiction.

† It is significant of the essential difference between the Anglican Ministry and the Catholic Priesthood that Parker's priestly character was in this formal sentence ignored. See above, p. 285.

said most serene Lady our Queen, committed unto us in this behalf." And such jurisdiction as Parker himself thus received, that and none other has he been able to transmit to his successors.

But there is another theory as to the source of Anglican jurisdiction ; and, with disestablishment in view, many High Churchmen seem prepared to accept it. Jurisdiction is thought to be inherent in every See, and the Bishop, when elected, thence obtains it, "just as the Pope does ;" for the Pope is a favourite precedent with the advanced school.* The theory, no doubt, is plausible, and has this much in its favour, that, unless the jurisdiction be lawfully withdrawn, a Catholic See does practically retain it during a vacancy ; for the Chapter has the right of electing an administrator, who can grant or withhold faculties, and the like, in the meanwhile. But this suggests the inquiry, How does this or that place come to be a See at all ? and can it never cease to be a See when it has once been such ? In other words, How is jurisdiction granted ? and can it never be withdrawn ? The answers to these questions render the theory untenable. In England at least there is no Apostolic See, such as might put forth a claim to have inherited an Apostolic universality of jurisdiction ; and, in point of fact, the jurisdiction resident in the ancient Catholic English Sees was granted them by the Pope ; and what the Pope has power to grant, he surely has power to withdraw, or, if he will, to transfer. So that, even if it were possible to maintain that he had not long ago withdrawn their jurisdiction from the ancient Sees, it is clear that he did so by the establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in 1851, and that West-

* It is not true that the Pope obtains his jurisdiction from his See. He receives it immediately from God, in virtue of his being the successor of St. Peter. See Mr. Thompson's "Unity of the Episcopate," chap. ii.

minster now possesses the rights that Canterbury and York have forfeited.

The notion of an inherent jurisdiction, which the Pope could create but not destroy, is not unlike the error of those cosmogonists, who thought the Creator had left creation to take care of itself, and indeed was unable to control the work of His own hands. Throughout Christendom there are numbers of extinct Sees, which, according to this theory, might at any moment be "revived," should any three Bishops care to elect, confirm, and consecrate a man with any such title. It is clear that such a view would lead to anarchy. And, moreover, even if we allowed the theory, and admitted that jurisdiction does remain *vi sua* in the old English Sees, so that their occupants do not really obtain from the Crown what formerly they received from the Vicar of Christ, yet Anglicans would practically be precluded from holding the theory with us, for they recognise without hesitation the new Sees of Parliamentary creation. If Lincoln, Lichfield, or Ely really do retain their ancient jurisdiction, yet whence do Manchester, Ripon, and St. Albans obtain theirs? But who accounts the clergy of these latter Sees to be in worse case as regards jurisdiction than those of the former? There is surely here a confession that Anglican jurisdiction is purely a matter of civil arrangement, and is not spiritual at all.

It is easy enough to protest that the Pope's universal jurisdiction has not unmistakably the warrant of "primitiveness." But, if we are to be primitive, let us be so in good earnest, and instead of stopping short at "the Patriarchal system," go right back to Apostolic times. Each Apostle had universal jurisdiction; Bishops are successors of the Apostles; *ergo*, each Bishop has the same; and, schism having become impossible, the reign

of confusion is consummated. But, in truth, it is folly for those who profess to accept Catholic principles, not to accept with them the living Church, which is their true home, and wherein the diocesan, provincial, and Patriarchal system grouped itself around Rome, the central See, possessed from the first, in virtue of the divine promises to St. Peter, of the plenitude of power, and the source and touchstone of all legitimate jurisdiction. Certain it is that, without the ordered unity, which thus and thus alone can be preserved, the Church could have no immunity from the encroachments of the State; and that, whether in England, Russia, Turkey, or where you will, union with the Pope alone can secure her freedom, and the purity of her faith and worship.

NOTE XI. (to p. 214).

Anglicanism and the Regulation of Confession.

In the year 1873 nearly five hundred Ritualistic clergy memorialised the Anglican Bishops to establish or permit (among other things more or less out of harmony with the traditional Church of England system) some method for the training and licensing of priests to hear confessions. It was a glorious opportunity for their Lordships to have taken into their own hands, with a view to its regulation, if not to its suppression, the modern practice of private confession within their Church. Had they boldly met the petitioners half-way, and said, "We admit the justice of your representation, which implies that the hearing of confessions needs oversight and regulation. On the principles of primitive and Catholic discipline which you profess, *we* are primarily the sole persons qualified to

absolve within our respective dioceses. Apart from us your absolutions are null. We therefore hereby call upon you neither to hear confessions nor to give absolution (the hour of death alone excepted) without our express permission and license. Meanwhile, in addition to ourselves, we grant faculties to absolve to A, B, and C, clergymen in whose discretion we fully confide; and to them, or to us, all penitents who desire formal absolution must have recourse"—had they taken some such line as this, they would have given satisfaction to High Churchmen, by admitting the theory of sacramental absolution, while they would have gone far to secure the practice of confession from possible abuse. As it was, however, dreading to appear to acknowledge the claim at all, the petition was timidly criticised, deprecated, and finally shelved; and so the Anglican Bishops practically handed over to their clergy the unrestricted exercise of a function, which nowhere, save in the Church of England, is discharged without stringent regulation. The Anglican Bishop has no means of obtaining intimate knowledge of the personal character of a candidate for ordination, nor of his qualifications for so onerous an office as that of confessor. Yet, so soon as he has laid his hands on him and said, "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c., the young priest has nothing to prevent him from inviting all, of whatever age, condition or sex, to come to him for private confession; and come they assuredly will, if he invites them; and then he may hear them in the vestry, or in his study, or where he will; and all the bench of Bishops cannot stop him. Should he be deprived of his benefice, or his license be withdrawn, this can make no difference. Ritualists indeed boast that, however successful their persecuting Bishops may be in depriving them of their ceremonial, they can do nothing to prevent them from hearing the confessions of their

adherents ; and they are logical enough in this ; for an authority to absolve, which neither license nor deed of institution has granted, no withdrawal of such a document can withhold.

Admitting that, generally speaking, those clergymen who now hear confessions in the Church of England are educated gentlemen, endowed with kindness and common sense, and, what is more important, "innocent in hands and clean in heart," still this does not get over the fact that the toleration granted to their proceedings opens the door to men of a very different stamp (and many with little culture and still less ecclesiastical training are now yearly added to the ranks of the Anglican clergy) to follow their example ; and it is certain that, if the practice of confession should become widely spread within the Church of England, instead of being, as it is now, the mere crotchet of a handful of enthusiasts, its want of regulation would be found so intolerable, as to suffice of itself to do considerably more than disestablish that Church. In the long-run, nothing but the Catholic system, by which only priests holding the Bishop's faculties may hear confessions, which faculties themselves may in a moment be withdrawn, should the Bishop have reason to suspect that the holder of them is not worthy of his office, will be found sufficient to meet the tremendous responsibilities which the administration of the Sacrament of Penance involves. And the Church is not content even with such safeguards as these. She insists on the public confessional in Church (some peculiar cases apart), which secures privacy without any of its dangers ; and her priests whom she places there must be men of approved lives, bound to celibacy, to the Mass, and to the Divine Office, to all of which they have shown themselves to have a divine vocation, after some years of special training in a

seminary or convent, under the eye of the Bishop, or of other ecclesiastical superiors.

NOTE XII. (to p. 302).

The Testimony of the English Martyrs.

The last utterances of those who are condemned to death for obstinate adherence to what they believe to be the truth, have always been regarded as weighty. Thus, the witness borne by some of the early martyrs to primary doctrines of the Christian religion has often been insisted on as second only in importance to the inspired language of Scripture. Nor is admiration withheld from that holy boldness which prompted them to set at naught the cruelty of their persecutors, and to scoff at the follies of the false religions which their judges professed.

History repeats itself; and they who have read of the sufferings of the martyrs under Diocletian, can hardly fail to be struck by the similarity between some of the trial scenes of that period, and others which are recorded in Bishop Challoner's "Missionary Priests," an account of the sufferings of certain English Catholics during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The judgment on Anglican Orders pronounced at the time of their condemnation by two or three of these martyrs is here appended, not only on account of the special weight which words spoken under such circumstances must bear, but also because of their intrinsic interest and force.

Father John Almond, who had been ordained priest in Rome in 1601, was martyred at Tyburn on December 5th, 1612. He is described as a man of great learning and sanctity of life, "a reprover of sin, a good example to

follow, of an ingenious and acute understanding, sharp and apprehensive in his conceits and answers, yet complete with modesty, full of courage, and ready to suffer for Christ, that suffered for him." The previous March he was brought before Dr. John King, Bishop of London, on the charge of being a priest. The Bishop sought to induce him to confess that he was such, but he evaded the point thus :—

Bishop. I ask, are you a priest ?

Almond. I am not Christ ; and unless I were Christ, in your own grounds, yours I mean, I cannot be a priest.

B. Though you cannot be one in our grounds, are you one in your own ?

A. If I be none, nor can be any, in your grounds, which allow no other Priesthood nor other priest but Christ, and you are bound to maintain your own grounds, and uphold the truth of them, you might well forbear this question, and suppose for certain that I am no priest.

B. Are you a priest, yea or no ?

A. No man accuseth me.

The account of his death, which is one of singular beauty, concludes thus :—

"As for Dr. King, Bishop of London, who is supposed to have been the principal promoter of Mr. Almond's death, instead of reaping any joy from the execution of this good priest, he is said to have been ever after a man of sorrows. And, if we may believe what is confidently asserted by the Catholic writers of those times, he was before his death favoured by a grace seldom granted to persecutors, to become himself a Catholic, and to die in the communion of that Church which he had cruelly persecuted." He is reported in his last hours to have invoked Almond in Paradise, and to have implored him to intercede for his pardon.

Father William Scot, a Benedictine, was examined by the same Bishop in May the same year. The account is as follows :—

“The Bishop still urged him to answer if he were a priest or no. My Lord, said he, are *you* a priest? No, said the prelate. No priest, no Bishop, said Mr. Scot. I am a priest, said the Bishop, but not a massing priest. If you are a priest, said Mr. Scot, you are a sacrificing priest; for sacrificing is essential to Priesthood; and if you are a sacrificing priest, you are a massing priest; for what other sacrifice have the priests of the New Law, as distinct from mere laics, to offer to God, but that of the Eucharist, which we call the Mass? If, then, you are no massing priest, you are no sacrificing priest; if no sacrificing priest, no priest at all, and consequently no Bishop.”

Dr. King appears to have been silenced by this argument; but nevertheless the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, which word Mr. Scot had no sooner heard, but he fell upon his knees, and said with a loud voice, “Thanks be to God;” adding that never any news was more welcome to him; and that there was nothing that he had ever wished for more in his life, than the happiness of dying for so good a cause. Then, turning himself to the people, he said, “I have not as yet confessed myself a priest, that the law might go on its course, and that it might appear whether they would proceed to condemn me upon mere presumption and conjectures, without any witness, which you see they have done. Wherefore, to the glory of God, and of all the Saints in Heaven, I now confess I am a monk of the Order of St. Bennet, and a priest of the Roman Catholic Church. But be you all witnesses, I pray you, that I have committed no crime against his Majesty or my country. I am only accused of Priesthood, and

for Priesthood alone I am condemned." He suffered May 30th, 1612.

Father Arthur Bell, a Franciscan friar, and a man of singular simplicity and holiness of life, was, with others, commissioned in 1643 by Pope Urban VIII. to inquire into the cause and manner of the deaths of those who had recently suffered for the faith in England, with a view to their beatification. But he and his papers fell into the hands of Parliament the same year; and on December 11th he was himself enrolled in the white-robed army of martyrs. In the course of his trial, he said "That he was certainly not a priest of the Levitical Order of Aaron; and that it would not be wisdom, if any one had a call from God to the Priesthood, to neglect the fountain head, and to take up with troubled water." Being asked the next day to explain the latter part of this sentence, he added, "What before appeared to you mysterious, I now explain. Whoever has a call from God to the Priesthood, let him seek it there where there is a certain and undoubted succession, never interrupted from Christ's time—viz., in the Roman communion; and not there where the succession is called in question, or rather, where without all question it has certainly failed, as it has amongst Protestants; for it is certain there is no true Priesthood in the Protestant Church."

NOTE XIII. (to p. 376).

Cardinal Newman's Argument.

"As to the possession by the Anglican Church of an Episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles,—well, it may have it, and if the Holy See ever so decide, I will believe

it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own ; but for myself, I must have St. Philip's gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily-attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it ; for antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts."—*Apologia pro Vita sua*, p. 341.

"The Apostolical Succession, its necessity and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition found in the Anglican Church. . . . And, considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have. I wonder how many of its Bishops and Deans hold the doctrine at this time ; some who do not occur to the mind at once. One knows what was the case thirty or forty years ago, by the famous saying of Blomfield, Bishop of London."

"If there is a true Succession, there is a true Eucharist ; if there is not a true Eucharist, there is no true Succession. Now what is the presumption here ? . . . If so great a gift be given, it must have a rite. . . . If it has a rite, it must have a *custos* of that rite. Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist ? The Anglican clergy ? Could I, without distressing an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they have been and are to their Eucharist ? *O bone custos*, in the words of the poet, *cui commendavi Filium meum !* Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the Anglican clergy, to hope, to believe, that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping ? And would our Lord leave himself for centuries in such hands ? Inasmuch, then, as the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ in the

Anglican communion is without protective ritual and jealous guardianship, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift nor its appointed guardians are to be found in that communion."—*The Month*, September, 1868, p. 270.

"Show me, if you can, any religious communion of present or past time, which has eventually on all hands been acknowledged to be a portion of the Catholic Church, on the strength of its Catholic Orders; which, nevertheless, has been for three whole centuries unanimously ignored by all the East and all the West; which for three centuries has employed the pens of its occasional and self-constituted defenders in laboriously clearing away, with but poor success, the aboriginal suspicions which have clung to it on the part of so many of the invalidity of those Orders; which, as if unthankful for such defence, has for three centuries persistently suffered the Apostolicity of those Orders, and the necessity and grace of such Apostolicity, to be slighted or denied by its Bishops, priests, and people with utter impunity; which has for three centuries been careless to make sure that its consecrating Bishops, and the Bishops who ordained the priests who were to be consecrated, and those priests themselves had been validly baptised; which has for three centuries neglected to protect its Eucharist from the profanations, not only of ignorance and unbelief, but of open sacrilege; show me such a case, such a long-sustained anomaly, and such ultimate recognition, and then I will allow that the recognition of Anglicanism on the part of the Holy See is not beyond the limits of reasonable expectation."—*The Month*, October, 1868, p. 425.

"I certainly do think Anglican Orders doubtful and

untrustworthy ; and that independent of any question arising out of Parker's consecration, into which I will not enter. Granting, for argument's sake, that that consecration was in all respects what its defenders say it was, still I feel a large difficulty in accepting the Anglican succession and commission of Ministry, arising out of the historical aspect of the Anglican Church, and of its prelates, an aspect which suggests a grave suspicion of the validity of their acts from first to last. . . . The consecrations of 1559 were not only facts, they were acts, and those acts were not done and over once for all, they were only the first of a series of acts done in a long course of years ; and these acts too, all of them, were done by men of certain positive opinions and intentions ; and none of those opinions and views, from first to last, were of a Catholic complexion, but, on the contrary, were erroneous and heretical. I question whether men of those opinions could by means of a mere rite or formulary, however correct in itself, start and continue in a religious communion, such as the Anglican, a ministerial succession which could be depended on as inviolate. I do not see what guarantee is producible for the faithful observance of a sacred rite in form, matter, and intention, through so long a period in the hands of such administrators. And again, the existing state of the Anglican body, so ignorant of fundamental truth, so overrun with diversified error, would be but a sorry outcome of Apostolical ordinances and graces. 'By their fruits shall ye know them.' Revelation involves in its very idea a teaching and a hearing of divine truth. What clear and steady light of truth is there in the Church of England ? What candlestick, upright and firm, on which it has been set ? . . . When we look at the Anglican communion, not in the books, in the imagination, or in the affections of its champions, its

claims to speak in Christ's name are refuted by its very condition. An Apostolical Ministry necessarily involves an Apostolical teaching."

"What Anglican candidate for the Priesthood has ever touched, physically, or even morally, paten or chalice in his ordination, from Archbishop Parker to Archbishop Tait? In truth, the Catholic rite, whether it differs from itself or not in different ages, still in every age, age after age, is itself, and nothing but itself. It is a concrete whole, one and indivisible, and acts *per modum unius*; and having been established by the Church, and being in present use and possession, it cannot be cut up into bits, be docked and twisted, or split into essentials and non-essentials, genus and species, matter and form, at the heretical will of a Cranmer or a Ridley, or be turned into a fancy Ordinal by a Royal Commission of divines, without a sacrilege perilous to its vitality. Though the delivery of the sacred vessels was not primitive, it was part of the existing rite three centuries ago, as it is now, and could not, and cannot be omitted, without prejudice to the ecclesiastical *status* of those who are ordained without it. . . . As the matter stands, all we see is a hierarchical body, whose opinions through three hundred years compromise their acts, who do not themselves believe that they have the gifts which their zealous adherents ascribe to them, who in their hearts deny those sacramental formulas which their country's law obliges them to use, who conscientiously shudder at assuming real Episcopal or sacerdotal power, who resolve, 'Receive the Holy Ghost' into a prayer, 'Whose sins ye remit they are remitted' into a license to preach, and 'This is my Body, this is my Blood' into an allegory. . . . If, indeed, earnestness of mind and purity of purpose could ever be a substitute for

the formal conditions of a Sacrament, which Apostles have instituted, and the Church maintains, certainly in that case one might imagine it to be so accepted in many an Anglican ordination. I do believe that in the case of many men it is the one great day of their lives, which cannot come twice, the day on which, in their fresh youth, they freely dedicated themselves and all their powers to the service of their Redeemer,—solemn and joyful at the time, and ever after fragrant in their memories:—it is so ; but devotion cannot reverse the past, nor can good faith fulfil its own aspirations ; and it is because I feel this, and in no temper of party, that I refuse to entertain an imagination, which is neither probable in fact nor Catholic in spirit.”—*Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. ii. pp. 76-84.

Several other pages of the Note to the same Essay are occupied with criticism of a retort attempted by some Anglican controversialists against the arguments contained in the letters to the *Month*, from which our second and third extracts are taken, to the effect that they tended to invalidate Catholic as well as Anglican Orders. This *tu quoque* argument may, no doubt, be very well urged by those who do not believe in the Church at all. For, accepting as we do the position that the succession is continued through single lines, and not by way of threefold interlacing cords, we have to maintain that each Bishop in the chain which historically connects (say) Cardinal Manning with the Apostles, was validly baptised, validly ordained to the Priesthood, and validly consecrated to the Episcopate,—ordinarily three distinct acts in connection with each person, the nullity of any single one of which would break the chain, while the great majority of these acts are now incapable of verification,—and it must be allowed that this position

is, humanly speaking, indefensible. But Catholics are, nevertheless, absolutely certain that they have the true ministerial succession, inasmuch as it is as indefectible as is the Church herself, whose permanence is guaranteed by divine promise.* Catholic Orders, equally with the Catholic faith, rest ultimately on the Word of God. Let Anglicans be sure they are Catholics, and within the Church, and then they will share in the security of this guarantee. But the whole history and character of Anglicanism make it absolutely necessary that they should prove the validity of their Orders, before they can claim that position. And, meanwhile, they should refrain from using an argument, which comes well enough from the lips of a sceptic, but not from those which say daily, "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church."

NOTE XIV. (to p. 377).

The Eastern Churches and Anglicanism.

Many of those who are active in promoting the spread of sacerdotalism within the Church of England, look to the East rather than to the West for ultimate recognition of the validity of their Orders, and of the legitimacy of their ecclesiastical position. They anticipate that they will be able to obtain "reunion with the Orthodox Church," and that the combination of these two "Branches" will produce "a Church" sufficiently strong to overawe the

* Catholics, of course, are not called upon to hold that in no single case has there been a Bishop, who, for lack of valid baptism, ordination or consecration, was a Bishop only in name. But they may well believe that the government of the Church would be so providentially ordered as to hinder such a person from being called upon to continue the succession. It falls to the lot of comparatively few Bishops to act as the principal consecrator of others.

"Latin Communion," and to induce her to abandon her pretensions to infallibility ; which things being done, concessions will be made by both sides, East and West will embrace, and the Secretary of the A. P. U. C. will modestly deprecate the compliments to which he will nevertheless be justly entitled for having accomplished from his chambers in London what Emperors, Councils, and Popes have failed to effect. Such is the reunionist's dream.

In what sense a junction effected between High Churchmen and one or other of the Oriental schismatical bodies could be called a "reunion" it is not easy to see ; since the East was separated from the West some centuries before Anglicanism came into existence ; nor is it clear on what constructive grounds the Anglican form of Christianity can claim relationship with Greek rather than with Latin Orthodoxy, seeing that history, geography, and race, as well as moral and intellectual life, indicate the latter rather than the former connection, as that which the Church of England should seek to recover, if she is ever to be corporately united to the Catholic world at all, a consummation which we have already given reasons for regarding as outside the region of probability. No doubt, certain Anglican controversialists have made desperate efforts to prove the "Eastern origin of British Christianity ;" but the theory can only be maintained by the acceptance of some highly improbable legends, and by the rejection of known historical facts. And, even if it were capable of proof, there would still remain the absurdity of men in this nineteenth century supposing that by an act of their will they could constitute themselves the legitimate representatives of a local Church, which, whatever may have been its origin and privileges, has certainly been extinct for more than twelve hundred years. The Church of England can only be defended as "a Church," on the

ground that the present Archbishop of Canterbury is a true successor of St. Augustine ; and he who believes this is bound to allow that he owes at least some obedience to the Pope, as to the Patriarch of the West, and the source of Anglican jurisdiction ; but he refuses to yield him any, because, being himself the supreme judge, he has decided that the Pope claims too much. To the East he can owe no obedience ; and perhaps herein lies the attraction of attempts at " reunion " therewith.

If then there be no legitimate ecclesiastical basis on which Anglicans and Orientals can fraternise, there may still be other reasons, intelligible enough, for the tenderness with which High Churchmen look to the East ; and these may be briefly specified. First and foremost is the sympathy which exists between all those who, however widely separated on other points, yet, having been born and educated in an atmosphere hostile to the rule of Rome, have imbibed a singular horror of that rule ; so that in later years, without exactly knowing why, they find it impossible not to hate and fear the Pope. And then again, High Churchmen feel that Oriental Christianity can be studied with security to themselves ; for, interesting as it undoubtedly is, it lacks that fascination which they find so uncomfortable when they contemplate the religion of Rome. Admiration for Orientalism leaves the Anglican admirer content with his own position ; admiration for Catholicism does not. Greek Christianity, and especially its early history and liturgies, are therefore unhesitatingly set before the students in Anglican Universities and Theological Colleges ; while Latin Christianity is as near as may be ignored. Moreover, Anglicans can fraternise with the " Orthodox " without giving offence to their people at home, who would be shocked at the thought of any deliberate approximation to Rome, but who are

commonly very ignorant of the true character of the practical religion of the Eastern Churches. High Church dignitaries can therefore without blame take an active part in the proceedings of the "Eastern Church Association;" whereas a "Roman Church Association" with similar objects in view, such as need not be inconsistent with loyalty to the Anglican communion, would never be able to count half a dozen notable members. And similarly, High Church travellers in the East are sure to meet with very considerable ignorance among Oriental ecclesiastics as to the origin, history, and character of the Anglican Church. If, therefore, they are sufficiently "advanced" to use such language, they may fearlessly say, "We English Catholics have the Mass like you, and employ vestments, lights, and incense at its celebration;" for their hearers would be wholly unlikely to be in a position to reply, as they might if they knew the facts, "Yes; but all this you can only do against the protest of your Bishops." And such professions, if coupled with strong language against Rome, would go far to persuade the hearers that hitherto they had not understood the real position of the Church of England; and might further dispose them to listen to proposals for "reunion" between the two "Branches;"—a notion which, apart from these pretensions, they would never have tolerated. Such, in fact, has been and is the false basis on which, *mutatis mutandis*, the Non-jurors in the eighteenth century, and the Ritualists in our own day, have sought and seek to establish inter-communion with the East.

It is, then, mainly as a set-off against Rome, whose claims they feel would be otherwise irresistible, that High Churchmen value the position of the Oriental Churches; though it may be doubted whether many of the Anglican admirers of Eastern Christianity are correctly

informed as to the real nature of that position. The generally received opinion appears to be somewhat as follows:—The Holy Orthodox Eastern Church, a vast and united community, includes within her fold four out of the five ancient Patriarchal Sees. She is the mother at this day of a hundred million Christians. She has preserved intact the faith of the undivided Church. She has jurisdiction over Palestine, the cradle-land of the Christian faith, and over Russia, whose youth she is at this moment training, and whose greatness in the future she will share. Her separation from Rome she deplures ; but she can point to the page of history to prove that it was her fidelity to her own unchanging traditions which suffered but did not cause the breach. Her separation, therefore, should not brand her as schismatical, for it was due to the restless ambition of the Popes. And she looks with confidence to the future, when that ambition shall have been broken, and when the justice with which she submitted to her enforced isolation shall be vindicated by some truly Œcumenical Council, which shall restore the unity of the Church.

Now this pretty and attractive picture, which is a summary of that estimate of Orientalism which may be found in the pages of Dean Stanley and of Dr. Neale, is in fact very incorrect, or is at best a very highly coloured “view.” They who do not believe in the divinely-ordained Supremacy of the Pope, can, of course, see nothing but ambition in acts, which (that being granted) appear in their true light as dignified assertions of a just right. No one, however, can read the history of a writer so little in sympathy with Rome as was the late Dean Milman, without confessing that throughout the controversies between East and West, which in the end resulted in the schism, the Greeks were mainly in the wrong ; while, as

to their perfidy, craft, and petty ambition there can be no question. The Popes who would not surrender their just prerogatives were Saints ; the Patriarchs of Constantinople who were eager for high-sounding titles were not.*

And then again, as to the retention by the East of the purity of the ancient faith, Dr. Pusey has recently shown that on the question of the Procession of the Holy Spirit the faith of Rome, and not the faith of Constantinople, is that of "the undivided Church." As to the Supremacy of the Holy See, which the Orientals now reject, there have been writers who have as near as may be demonstrated it, using solely the words of Greek Saints before the date of the schism. And in regard to the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mother of God, it is well known that the earliest expressions of that glorious truth are found in the East and not in the West ; and Father Tondini has pointed out that it is still implied in the language of the Oriental ritual ; though, on the other hand, it is true that now there are to be found Eastern theologians who, characteristically enough, deny it, the doctrine having been defined by Rome. Moreover, the actual number of the Oriental schismatics, though not in itself a matter of primary importance, has been considerably exaggerated. Seventy millions would appear to be nearer the mark than the hundred millions of Dean Stanley ; and this figure does not represent the members of one united Church. It is on this point, which is of far greater importance than the mere question of numbers, that Anglicans appear to be so gravely mistaken. Upholders of the "Branch theory" commonly speak of "the Eastern Church" as being one of the three ; though in truth there

* It was a Patriarch of Constantinople who first sought to be styled "œcumenical ;" and the title, merely complimentary at the first, is still retained, though now it is simply absurd.

are many Eastern Churches ; and the tendency of schismatic Oriental Christianity is more and more to division. Some of these " Churches " are divided the one from the other in matters of faith, regard each other as heretical, and will on no account communicate together. Such are the Nestorian, Armenian, Syrian, and Coptic Churches, which are all separated from the Greek Church properly so called. And even this last, though one in faith, is split into fragments, and is no longer capable of corporate action. It claims, indeed, to possess four out of the five ancient Patriarchates ; but when it is added that the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem can only claim some 25,000 subjects, and he of Alexandria not more than 5000, while all four reside in or near Constantinople, it will be seen how hollow such pretensions are.

The existing divisions of the Greek Church are mainly due to political action. Apart from Rome the principle of nationalism is supreme, and no ecclesiastical traditions, however venerable, can stand against it. The Russian Church is the principal branch of Oriental Christianity, but it is no longer in actual union with the See of Constantinople.* The separation took place in 1587; and in 1721 Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow, and appointed the " Holy Synod," a kind of Upper House of Convocation subject to the civil power, to take its place; and by this change the Russian Church,

* It is a common Anglican assertion that Russian Christianity is the offspring of the Greek Church, born after the separation from Rome. But Mr. Thompson has pointed out (" Unity of the Episcopate," p. 221, *note*) that the Russian nation was converted to the faith before the consummation of the Greek schism by Michael Cerularius, and that, after that event, the Russian Church was in communion with the Holy See (apart from occasional interruptions) until the fifteenth century, and only revolted as a whole from allegiance to the Pope in 1520. An elaborately detailed account of the subjugation of the Russian Church by the civil power in the seventeenth century will be found in Mr. William Palmer's " The Patriarch and the Tzar," 6 vols. (London: Trübner, 1871-1876.)

though not, like the Anglican, Erastian in principle, has become even more completely such in practice. Moreover, of the fifty millions who nominally belong to it, at least thirteen millions, called "Old Believers," are really separate from and hostile to it; and, in addition to this formidable schism, numerous heretical sects have gone forth from it, one of which is said to number a million disciples. Meanwhile the educated classes are lapsing into indifference or a fanatical Nihilism; so that, apart from its political position, the Russian Church has no very great influence, and seems likely to break up with that tyrannical State system to which it is so closely allied; unless, indeed, it should save itself from dissolution by union with the Holy See. Other branches of the Greek Church, in Greece itself, in Austria, Servia, Montenegro, Cyprus, and elsewhere, have since the beginning of this century become independent national Churches; so that the Patriarch of Constantinople, who has for long been subject to the Sublime Porte, now rules over a much diminished flock.*

These facts suffice to show that "the Eastern Church" is a mere form of expression, to which no existing community precisely corresponds; for these various national Churches are not capable of united action; and, should High Churchmen succeed in obtaining intercommunion with one of them, the others would by no means be bound by the act, and, indeed, would probably repudiate it with indignation, should it be thought to have political significance; for such unity as the Oriental Churches possess does little or nothing towards the softening down of national jealousies.

* Quite recently his flock has been still further diminished by the transfer of the "Orthodox" of Bosnia to the jurisdiction of the Austrian Patriarch who resides at Carlowitz.

Moreover, in estimating the significance of Orientalism in those countries in which it prevails, it must not be forgotten that it does not occupy the whole of the ground. Bishops in communion with Rome are to be found everywhere in the East, and they have no lack of subjects. Even the Russian Czar has between eight and nine millions of Catholics beneath his sway; Austria against seven millions schismatics has twenty-three million Catholics; and at least a million more are to be found in the triangle between the Danube, the Save, and Cape Matapan, where, at the beginning of the century, Mahometanism and "Orthodoxy" reigned supreme. And, what is more remarkable, in many of the towns of Syria and Palestine the majority of the Christians are now Catholics; while in some districts none others are to be found.

The moral and religious condition of the Eastern Churches is a subject on which travellers are very generally agreed. Of course their statements admit of exceptions; but, after allowances have been made, it appears to be certain that among the Russian secular clergy ignorance and drunkenness are so common as to be the rule; while simony and other such corruptions are similarly prevalent among the schismatics in the Ottoman Empire and in Greece. Men of a higher stamp, as, for example, the late Archbishop Lycurgus, who visited England a few years since, are no doubt occasionally to be found among the superior clergy; but such exceptions are rare. And, as to the actual practice of their religion among the Oriental Christians, there is abundance of testimony to the fact that, though its obligations are performed with scrupulous exactness, and with every outward sign of devotion, yet that it is ordinarily a hard mechanical ritualism, with which the heart has but little to do, and which exercises no very deep influence over the conduct of even its most staunch adherents.

It is, then, to these soulless and decaying Churches that some Anglicans are disposed to turn, seeking the recognition of the validity of their Orders, and ultimately "reunion." As to the former point, there has been, of course, no formal acknowledgment, nor, for that matter, any official inquiry. It is true that Oriental prelates, more or less heretical, have from time to time addressed quaint flattering letters to the Archbishop of Canterbury, styling him a "fellow-Bishop," or in some other way admitting the legitimacy of his ecclesiastical position. But no prudent man would place much reliance on the attitude temporarily assumed by the crafty ministers of corrupt and simoniacal communities, such as of some of the Eastern Churches undoubtedly are. They seek to fraternise on the ground of a common hostility to Rome ; for in what else are they in sympathy with the average Anglican Bishop ? and their letters will be always found to express or imply some reference to the length of purse which they have ascertained that the "Lord of Canterbury" enjoys.

Dr. Lee thought he had secured a valuable witness on the part of the East to the validity of Anglican Orders, when, after considerable difficulties, he had succeeded in obtaining through a friend the signatures of four Oriental theologians to a kind of legal "opinion," wherein they affirmed that in their judgment the Anglican rites were "sufficient in themselves" to confer valid Orders. But to this opinion Catholics who reject Anglican Orders might be willing to subscribe ; for the question is not whether the rites are sufficient in themselves, but whether they were sufficient under the circumstances of their compilation and use in the sixteenth century ; and it is inconceivable that any Oriental divine, who was fairly informed of the facts, would allow this.

And, indeed, the value of this testimony cannot be

very great ; for it appears that the Greeks at the Bonn "Conference" declined to admit the validity of Anglican Orders ; while two "Orthodox" writers, who from their connection with the West have had some means of forming a judgment, either deny them or speak doubtfully concerning what they involve. Thus, the Abbé Guettée (a French priest, who seceded to the Russian Church, after distinguishing himself as an opponent of the Jesuits, and as a writer of ecclesiastical history from the Gallican point of view), while endeavouring to harmonise Anglican with Orthodox doctrine, found himself, nevertheless, compelled to speak thus doubtfully of the Anglican Eucharist : "If the Thirty-nine Articles are a commentary on the Prayer-book, one cannot believe that there is a true Liturgy in the Anglican Church."* And this admission is all the more remarkable, since the writer throughout his treatise endeavoured to exalt Anglicanism at the expense of Rome ; and seems to have accepted, on the authority of some High Church friend, and without further examination, the validity of Anglican Orders, forgetting that they involve a valid Eucharist. He would have been more logical had he interpreted the doubtful question of Orders by the unmistakable evidence of the Anglican estimate of the latter rite. A more decidedly adverse testimony is furnished by Dr. Overbeck. This divine, originally a German priest, and as such, according to his own account, "an adherent of the Liberal school," for a time conformed to Lutheranism, but in 1865 allied himself with the Orientals. He explicitly denies that at Bonn Anglican Orders were recognised, save by a few "Old Catholics;" and he points out that the question is by no means an exclusively historical one, but is essentially

* "Exposition de la Doctrine Orthodoxe," p. 458.

dogmatic.* And in another publication he says that the Orientals cannot do otherwise than imitate the "rigorous orthodoxy" of the Latins in ordaining *ab initio* convert Anglican clergymen; adding positively, that "the Orthodox Church does not recognise the English Church to be a Church at all."† This last statement is fully confirmed by an incident recorded in the "Report of the Anglo-Continental Society" for the year 1875. It appears that the Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar, whose jurisdiction is almost Papal in its extent, asked the Patriarch of Constantinople whether he would really have to baptise him should he join their Church. The Oriental at first answered evasively; but the Bishop insisting on his question, he received a reply in the affirmative. Clearly a man cannot be recognised as a priest by those who regard his baptism, not merely as doubtful, but as absolutely invalid; and the Greeks (though not the Russians) admit only baptism by immersion.

Thus much, then, may be said as to the prospect of an acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican Orders on the part of Orientals. It is "a consummation devoutly to be wished" by those who adopt the High Church position; but it is also one which will recede more and more into the region of the improbable and the impossible as Eastern theologians come to be better acquainted with the actual history and condition of the Anglican Church, and learn that those Ritualistic clergymen whom they have chanced to meet, and whose Catholic language they have listened to with surprise, would speak in a very different tone in the presence of their own Bishops, and hold, in fact, within

* "The Bonn Conferences" (Trübner, 1875), p. 31.

† "Intercommunion between the English and Orthodox Churches," pp. 71, 89.

their own Church a position not very distinguishable from that of tolerated outlaws.

Under such circumstances it is clear that any real "reunion" between Anglicanism and the East is beyond the limits of reasonable expectation. Political events might no doubt lead to some kind of fraternisation with one or other of the smaller Eastern Churches, as, for example, that of Cyprus, towards which High Churchmen are already manifesting a tenderness not very consistent with their fierceness against the "Mariolatry" of Rome. But what political events might bring about, other political events would soon undo; nor in any case could there be permanence in a merely superficial union. And real religious unity between Anglicanism and any branch of Orientalism is certainly out of the question. The tattered old garment of the East could not endure the insertion of so modern a patch as is in fact the High Church theory of the position of the Church of England. No doubt, a handful of self-commissioned men on either side may meet and amicably discuss various theological questions, and may sign documents which either ignore the serious points at issue between the parties attempting to fraternise, or else cleverly evade them by the use of language capable of more than one interpretation. But the significance of such a *rapprochement* is infinitesimal. Nothing worthy of record is done unless the Anglican and Oriental Bishops, carrying with them the sympathy of their clergy and people, formally unite in preliminary negotiations with a view to intercommunion. And even then it is incredible that any such efforts should prove otherwise than barren; for the "unchanging East" must be changed indeed before she will be ready to welcome to her bosom indiscriminately the members of a community so indefinite in faith and so increasingly divided as is the Church of England. Indeed,

it daily becomes clearer that Anglo-Oriental schemes for union are now merely the crotchets of a few "viewy" individuals, who dabble in them because they find they can thus bolster up their own priestly pretensions, at the same time distracting their attention from the claims of Rome, whose fascination they must by some means withstand. And it is not a little significant that Dr. Pusey (who alone among High Churchmen has continuously maintained the same position, remarkable thus for steadfastness, if not for logic) has recently withdrawn his name from the "Eastern Church Association," in consequence of the hostile and aggressive attitude of certain Oriental prelates.

The Christians of the East need unity, and can only obtain it in one way. Such coherence as the various Churches now possess is based in very considerable measure on a common hatred of Rome. A truer unity in the future may result from a common love. Probably the southern communities, already shrunk to such small proportions, will in time die out, or be absorbed by the vigorous Uniate Catholic Churches alongside of them. But a corporate return of Russian Christianity to Catholic unity is by no means out of the question. Such an event may be impossible so long as the Russian Church retains its present relations with the State, and the accompanying circumstances of pride and wealth. But changes may any day occur, such as would end in its turning its eyes towards Rome, humbled and poor, but free ; and Peter the Fisherman will then be able to give it what Peter the Great could not.*

* Much valuable information as to the condition of Oriental Christianity and its probable future will be found in Döllinger's "Church and the Churches," pp. 122-142; in Marshall's "Christian Missions," vol. ii., pp. 1-122; "Missions in the Levant;" Tondini's "Popes of Rome and the Popes of the Oriental Church;" the same writer's "Future of the Russian Church;" Gagarin's, "The Russian Clergy," and "La Russie sera-t-elle Catholique?" and Schouvaloff's "Ma Conversion et ma Vocation." Paris: Douniol, 1859.

NOTE XV. (to p. 394).

Anglican Internal Disunion.

The want of dogmatic unity within the Church of England is not confined to the differences by which the three great parties, High, Low, and Broad, are separated from each other. The magnitude of these differences is undeniable, and it is such as to produce a feeling of amazement in the minds of foreign Catholics, when they learn that the same religious community retains in its fold men whose faith, principles, and practice belong to three distinct platforms, irreconcilable with each other. No other "Church" or sect can present such a phenomenon; nor indeed will the Church of England herself be able to do so for long, when the arm of the State has ceased to hold her members together. But these fundamental differences seldom come to the surface, for the reason that men whose "views" are pronounced in one direction or another, commonly abstain from the discussion of religious subjects with those who are known not to belong to the same party as themselves. They contrive to come across one another as little as possible; and if they do chance to meet, the fact that they are the duly-constituted ministers of the same religious community is ignored by common consent; and they fraternise as gentlemen, as archæologists, as musical men, as philanthropists, as landlords, as magistrates, or on whatever other ground they may have in common, Churchmanship excepted.

But even if the Ritualistic party, numbering perhaps a thousand clergy of "extreme views," be taken apart from the rest, grave differences, even on fundamental points and on questions of the utmost practical importance, will be found to exist, and manifest their existence, when any

number of these men (all, be it remembered, professing to be guided by the Vincentian rule, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*) meet together to discuss religious topics. From his own knowledge of the serious divisions of opinion existing among advanced High Churchmen, the writer does not fear to challenge any twelve of them to answer some such questions as the following, holding no communication with each other from the time that they have seen the questions, until after they have given in their answers to an impartial judge, who shall decide whether those answers do not in many cases differ, not merely in language or in tone, but in substance and principle, and are in fact mutually contradictory ; so that no definite dogmatic teaching could be founded upon them :—

1. What is faith? 2. Can we be saved by faith alone? 3. How are we to know what we have to believe? 4. What is the Catholic Church? 5. Has the Church a visible Head on earth? 6. What is the true position of the Bishop of Rome? 7. How is the Church One? 8. Can the Church err in her teaching? 9. Is the Pope under any circumstances infallible? 10. What means "the Communion of Saints?" 11. Is there a Purgatory? 12. What aid can we give to the faithful departed? 13. How is sin committed after baptism ordinarily forgiven? 14. Was the Blessed Virgin Mary conceived and born in sin? 15. Do the Angels and Saints in heaven intercede for us? 16. May we honour them or pray to them? 17. What honour may we pay to crucifixes and images? 18. How is Sunday to be kept holy? 19. How many Sacraments are there? 20. What persons are bound to go to confession? 21. What is the Holy Eucharist? 22. In what sense is the Holy Eucharist a Sacrifice? 23. Is transubstantiation the true doctrine? 24. Are we

bound to receive Holy Communion fasting? 25. In what matters of faith has the Church of Rome erred?

The writer does not believe that three High Churchmen could be found who would answer all the above questions in the same sense; whereas not three instructed Catholics could be found who would differ on any of them. Others might be suggested; but these will suffice, relating as they do, either to fundamental principles, or to matters of daily practical importance, to show that Anglicans, who sincerely desire to conform their lives to the rule of Jesus Christ as presented to them by their High Church teachers, have serious difficulties in ascertaining that rule. There is, however, one more question which should be proposed to those clergymen who would answer the above questions, or most of them, in the same terms as a Catholic—"Do you boldly teach your people what you here profess as your own faith? and does your Bishop know and approve of your thus teaching them?" An honest answer to this inquiry would finally dispose of any attempt to assert that the Church of England is in any intelligible sense a part of the *Ecclesia docens*.

In spite, however, of its grave internal disunion, the Anglican Church preserves with considerable success an external semblance of unity. As has been said, it is to its being the established religion that this is mainly due. But, beyond this, various motives combine to induce those who are within it with the most discordant opinions, to be tolerant towards one another's views. The great increase of religious Liberalism, which is another term for indifference to or practical disbelief in great districts of religious truth, has much influence in this direction. Then again, there is the respectful reticence which is part of a gentleman's education; the dread of playing into the hands of the common enemy, the political Nonconformist; and a

very reasonable modesty, which prevents men from denouncing the opinions of their opponents, when they are secretly conscious that their own views, however dear to them, are not capable of a more logical defence. But beneath the superficial unity thus produced there is in fact endless variety of opinion, and that not merely on speculative or unimportant points ; and he would be indeed a bold man who would venture seriously to compare the utter divergence in faith and principles characteristic of the inclusiveness of the Anglican Church, with the freedom allowed within the Catholic Church to various schools of thought in their discussion of questions not yet defined by her infallible voice.

NOTE XVI.

A Table of the Anglican Succession.

Taking for granted the doctrine that the assistant Bishops at an Episcopal consecration are not to be accounted independent Consecrators (and the contrary position cannot be maintained unless some very substantial evidence is adduced, more convincing than that precarious deduction from a rare opinion which has been referred to above), it follows that the succession must be traced in single lines. Had Barlow, Hodgkins, Scory, and Coverdale acted as principal Consecrators subsequently to Parker's consecration, the Anglican succession might have been continued in four distinct lines, three of which would have united in Cranmer, and probably the fourth (Barlow) as well, could his consecration be proved. But in point of fact, unless the Irish succession be distinct, all Anglican Orders depend on the line which is traced in the Table below.

The spiritual pedigree of *Dr. Tait*, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, includes that of the majority of the Anglican Bishops now at work in England and the Colonies. All the others depend (so far as the writer has been able to ascertain) on his Grace's immediate predecessor, *Dr. Longley*, or on the last two occupants of the See of York. It may be well, therefore, to point out that these also depend on the same line.

Charles Thomas Longley had been consecrated Bishop of Ripon on Nov. 6th, 1836, by *Dr. Vernon [Harcourt]*, Archbishop of York, whose name appears third in the list below.

William Thomson, the present Archbishop of York, was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol on Dec. 15th, 1861, by *Dr. Sumner*, Archbishop of Canterbury, whose name appears second in the list below.

Thomas Musgrave, who preceded *Dr. Longley* in the See of York, had been consecrated Bishop of Hereford on Oct. 1st, 1837, by *William Howley*, Archbishop of Canterbury (*Dr. Sumner's* predecessor), who had been consecrated Bishop of London on Oct. 3rd, 1813, by *Charles Manners Sutton*, who had been consecrated Bishop of Norwich on April 8th, 1792, by *John Moore*, who had been consecrated Bishop of Bangor on Feb. 12th, 1775, by *Frederic Cornwallis*, who had been consecrated Bishop of Lichfield on Feb. 8th, 1749, by *Thomas Herring*, whose name appears sixth in the list below.

Moreover, it was *John Moore*, the Archbishop of Canterbury above mentioned, who, on Feb. 4th, 1787, consecrated *William White*, Bishop of Pennsylvania; and on him (as he performed all the American consecrations during a period of more than forty years) all the Orders in the American Protestant Episcopal Church depend.

It thus appears that the Apostolical descent of all the

Anglican clergy in England, America and the Colonies, centres in *Thomas Herring*, a divine, whose energetic support to the House of Hanover won him rapid promotion from Bangor to York, and from York to Canterbury. There is no reason to suppose that he was more of a Protestant than the Anglicans of his day; but the following sentence from one of his sermons is worth quoting as indicating his own estimate of those supernatural powers which, as a High Priest of the Catholic Church, we are now called upon to believe that he possessed:—"We pretend not to miracles, we leave the pretence of them to a Church which has nothing else to support its corrupt and foolish doctrines but such bold and impious falsehoods."*

The existing Orders of the Scotch Episcopal Church fall into the line a little higher up. They depend on *George Gleig*, who was consecrated Bishop of Brechin in 1808. From him the line is traced through *John Skinner*, *Robert Kilgour*, *William Falconar*, *Thomas Rattray*, *James Gadderar*, and *George Hickes*, to *Thomas White*, the Non-juring Bishop of Peterborough, who in 1685 had been consecrated by *William Sancroft*, whose name appears ninth in the list below.

As to the succession of the existing Irish Protestant Episcopate, the writer has been unable to ascertain whether it descends in an independent line from Curwen, the Archbishop of Dublin, who apostatised on the accession of Elizabeth. The Orders of the present Bishops all centre in *Dr. Beresford*, who was consecrated Bishop of Cork in 1805, and was translated to Armagh in 1822, which See he held until 1862, when he was succeeded by the present Archbishop of the same name and family.

* "Sermons" (1763), p. 35. The learned doctor was preaching at an S.P.G. Anniversary, and was apologising for the non-performance of miracles by the Protestant missionaries.

Who his Consecrator was the writer cannot discover ; but should it have been the *Hon. William Stuart*, Archbishop of Armagh, who had been translated from St. David's in 1800, having been consecrated to that See in 1794 by the same *John Moore*, Archbishop of Canterbury, on whom the American succession depends, it would follow that the existing Irish succession, as well as the English, Scotch, and American, can be traced only in that single line which ends with Barlow, and which is here appended.

	Name.	As Consecrator held the See of	Year of Promotion.	Consecrated to the See of	Date of Consecration.
1	Archibald Campbell Tait	Canterbury	1868	London	Nov. 23, 1856
2	John Bird Sumner	Canterbury	1848	Chester	Sept. 21, 1828
3	Edward Vernon [Harcourt]	York	1808	Carlisle	Nov. 6, 1790
4	William Markham	York	1777	Chester	Feb. 17, 1771
5	Robert Drummond	York	1761	St. Asaph	April 24, 1748
6	Thomas Herring	Canterbury	1747	Bangor	Jan. 15, 1737
7	John Potter	Canterbury	1737	Oxford	May 15, 1715
8	Jonathan Trelawney	Winchester	1707	Bristol	Nov. 8, 1685
9	William Sancroft	Canterbury	—	Canterbury	Jan. 27, 1677
10	Henry Compton	London	1675	Oxford	Dec. 6, 1674
11	Gilbert Sheldon	Canterbury	1663	London	Oct. 18, 1660
12	Brian Duppa	Winchester	1660	Chichester	June 17, 1638
13	William Laud	Canterbury	1633	St. Davids	Nov. 18, 1621
14	George Montaigne	London	1621	Lincoln	Dec. 14, 1617
15	George Abbot	Canterbury	1611	Lichfield	Dec. 3, 1609
16	Richard Bancroft	Canterbury	1604	London	May 8, 1597
17	John Whitgift	Canterbury	1583	Worcester	April 21, 1577
18	Edmund Grindal	Canterbury	1573	London	Dec. 21, 1559
19	Matthew Parker	Canterbury	—	Canterbury	Dec. 17, 1559
20	William Barlow	None	—	St. Davids?	1536?

INDEX.

AARONIC Priesthood, 444, 517
 Abbot, Abp., 340, 505
 Abyssinian ordination, 154, 166, 259 *sq.*, 266, 281, 385
Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, an ambiguous form, 158
 Achonry, Bp. of, 129
 Act of Parliament (8 Eliz. cap. 1), 116
 Act of Uniformity, 112, 118
 Adrian I., Pope, 285
 Alb, authorised by P.B. of 1549, 99
 Ales' Latin P.B., 230
 Alexander VIII., Pope, 177
 Alexandria, Greek Patriarch of, 529
 Almond, Father John, 515
 Alphonso, St., 220, 247
 Altar, not in the Anglican Church, 240 *sq.*
 Alzog's Church History, 210 *n*
 Ambrose, St., 284
 American Protestant Church, 45 *n*, 271 *n*, 412 *n*, 541
 Andrewes, Bp., 136
 Anglican Church unsacerdotal in character, 89, 252
 „ ordination not a sacrament, 151, 159, 167, 251 *sq.*
 „ principles uncertain, 14, 409
 Anglo-Catholicism, 168, 360 *sq.*, 395
 Anglo-Continental Society, 534
 Anglo-Protestant ordination, supposed, 412
Animus imponentium fixes the sense of a sacramental form, 216 *n*, 386
 Apostles, ordination of the, 160, 246
 „ jurisdiction of the, 499, 510

Apostolic, in what sense the Church is, 22
 Apostolical succession, an ambiguous phrase, 33
 “A. P. U. C.,” 458, 524
 Article xxii., 461, xxv., 295, xxxi., 195, xxxvi., 295, 369
 Athanasian Creed, 80, 84, 271 *n*
 Athanasius, St., 179 *n*
 Augustine of Canterbury, St., 329, 409 *n*, 481 *sq.*
 Augustine, St., quoted, 8 *n*, 18 *n*, 35 *n*, 446 *n*

BAILEY, Rev. T. J., 275, 304, 322, 324 *n*, 343 *n*, 383, 405 *n*, 427 *n*
 Bancroft, Bp., 353
 Baptism, 19, 158, 177, 203, 206, 374 *sq.*, 470
 Barlow, Bp., 95, 113, 125, 191, 303 *sq.*, 326, 342, 397, 540
 Becon, Thomas, 195 *n*
 Bede, Venerable, 329 *n*
 Bell, Father Arthur, 517
 Bellarmine, 187, 285 *n*, 480 *n*
 Benedict XIV., Pope, 182, 247, 267, 485
 Benediction, 205
 Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., 375 *n*
 “Black Rubric,” 200
 Bonaventure, St., 186
 Bonn Conference, 533
 Bonner, Bp., 104 *n*, 313, 347
 Bossuet, Bp., 137, 138 *n*
 Bourne, Bp., 113, 317 *n*
 Brady, Dr. Maziere, 321 *n*

Bramhall, 336, 350 *n*, 360, 370, 405 *n*
 Brett, Dr., 60
 Bright, Dr., 217 *n*, 329 *n*, 409 *n*
 Bright and Medd's Latin P.B., 132
 British Church, 524
 Bucer, 153, 252
 Burnet's Reformation, quoted, 93 *n*
 Busenbaum, 176, 274
 Butler, Bp., 123 *n*

CALVIN, John, 194
 Campion, Edmund, 123, 195 *n*
 Canons of 1603, 237
 "Cant," 362
 Cardwell's "Synodalia," 464 *n*
 Caroline P. B. of 1662, 200, 219 *n*,
 238, 254 *n*, 255 *n*, 301, 359, 496
 "Catholic World," quoted, 25, 95 *n*,
 168, 313, 315, 339
 Cecil, Lord Burleigh, 337 *n*, 350 *n*
 Cerularius, Michael, 462, 529 *n*
 Challoner's "Missionary Priests," 97 *n*,
 514
 Champney, Dr., 315, 367
 Changes made in the Church's rites,
 155 *sq.*
 "Character," 120 *n*, 186 *n*, 487
 Cheney, Bp., 123 *n*, 195
 Chichele, Abp., 324 *n*
 Church, definitions of the, 20, 498 *n*
 "Church and Realm," 253 *sq.*
 "Church Quarterly," 95 *n*, 144 *n*, 153 *n*,
 174 *n*, 185 *n*, 246 *n*, 276, 384 *n*, 396 *n*,
 400 *n*, 405 *n*
 "Clergyman of the old school," 35
 Clerical converts, 123, 400 *n*
 Clement, St., fragments of, 501 *n*
 Coke, Lord Chief Justice, 136
 Confession in the Church of England,
 214, 221, 222 *n*, 511
 Confirmation, Sacrament of, 187, 204
 "Congregation" meaning "Church,"
 255
 Concelebration, 246, 328 *n*
 Consecration, Protestant idea of, 295 *n*
 " of Churches, 205
 " in one kind, 59, 191
 " Prayer of, 200

Consecrations, schismatical under
 Henry VIII., 131, 176
Consecratoria verba, the forms of the
 Sacraments, 271
 Conservatism of the Church of Eng-
 land, 47, 484
 Constantinople, Patriarch of, 528, 534
 Conversion, 415, 441, 476
 Convocation, Catholic, 110; Protestant,
 464 *n*
 Coöperation, 319 *sq.*
 Cope, use of, 99, 192, 345, 351
 Coronation Service, 6 *n*, 240
 Councils, œcumenical, 466
 Courayer, Father, 124 *n*, 125, 270 *sq.*,
 280, 322, 372
 Courts, Anglican ecclesiastical, 505
 Coverdale, Bp., 114, 317
 Cox, Dr., 108, 483 *n*
 Cranmer, Abp., 99, 105, 153, 154,
 168, 176, 269, 310, 540
 Cummins, Bp., 427 *n*
 Curwen, Abp., 321 *n*, 542
 Cyprus, Church of, 535
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 69 *n*

DAVENPORT, Father, 127, 369,
 370 *n*
 Declaration made by the Elizabethan
 clergy, 93 *n*
 " made by Anglican Bishops,
 504 *n*
 De Dominis, Abp., 125, 320 *n*
 De Lugo, 245 *n*
 Development, 499
 Diaconate, 148 *sq.*
 Dishonesty, charge of, 398 *n*, 444,
 449 *sq.*
 Dodd's Dissertation on Protestant
 Orders, 139, 372
 Döllinger, Dr., 60 *n*, 233, 536 *n*
 Dort, Synod of, 56 *n*
 "Dublin Review," 443
 Durandus, 164

EASTERN Churches, 40, 331 *n*,
 377, 523 *sq.*
Ecclesia docens, 539

Edward VI., accession of, 98
 „ First P.B., 192 *sq.*
 „ Second P.B., 194 *sq.*, 201, 216 *n*
 „ Ordinal, 98 *sq.*, 113, 116, 191
 Election and jurisdiction, 507
 Elizabeth, accession of, 108; her policy,
 111, 233, 390, 482, 496
 Elizabethan period, 51, 346 *sq.*
 „ persecution, 97 *n*, 352
 „ Prayer Book, 194, 201
 Elrington, 336
 “English Orders,” 408
 Episcopacy, Anglican, 119, 146, 148 *n*,
 170
 “Episcopal Church,” 37 *n*
 Episcopate, the High Priesthood, 82,
 149, 187, 284 *sq.*, 490
 Erastianism, 254 *sq.*
 Estcourt, Canon, 25, 384, quoted *passim*
 „ „ letter from, 133 *n*
 „ „ on Anglican absolu-
 tions, 216 *n*
 Eucharist, the Holy, 60 *n*; Anglican
 treatment of the, 19, 69
 Eugenius IV., Pope, 371 *n*, 489
 Eusebius, quoted, 149
 Excommunication of Elizabeth, 97,
 108
 Extreme Unction, Sacrament of, 204

FAIRCLOUGH, Father, 341
 Ferrer, Bp., 98 *n*, 105
 Florence, Council of, 17 *n*, 142, 197,
 371 *n*, 462
 Forbes, Bp., 128, 370 *n*, 381, 405 *n*
 Foxe, the martyrologist, 106
 Foxe's MS., 327, 342, 348
 Francis of Sales, St., 84 *n*
 Franzelin, Cardinal, 177
 Froude, Mr. J. A., 321 *n*
 Fulke, Dr., 148, 195 *n*, 348
 Fuller, quoted, 136

GAGARIN, Rev. P., 536 *n*
 Gallicanism, 267, 276, 371
 Gardiner, Bp., 311
 Gazzaniga, 139 *n*

German Catholics, sufferings of the,
 111, 236, 450
 Gibraltar, Bp. of, 534
 Goffe, Dr., 127
 “Good faith,” 35, 50, 403
 Goodman, Bp., 123 *n*
 Gordon, Bp., 123, 138 *n*, 262 *n*
 “Gospel Ministry,” 146, 153, 155,
 159
Grace d'état, 294 *n*
 Grace received in the Church of Eng-
 land, 80, 401 *sq.*, 433
 Greek rites, 154, 266, 331 *n*
 Gregg, Bp., 427 *n*
 Gregory I., Pope St., 329
 Grindal, Abp., 195 *n*, 505
 “Guardian,” quoted, 380 *n*, 427 *n*
 Guettée, Abbé, 533
 Gury, quoted, 156

HADDAN, Rev. A. W., 95, 307,
 382
 Haddon's Latin P. B., 230
 Hallier, 323 *n*
 Hanoverian period, 61
 Harding's controversy with Jewell,
 348
 Hardouin, 372
 Herring, Abp., 376, 542
 Hodgkins, Bp., 114, 317
 Holy Synod, the Russian, 529
 Homage of Anglican Bishops, 504 *n*
 Hook, Dr., 216 *n*
 Hooker, Richard, 55, 170, 186 *n*, 202 *n*,
 214, 218 *n*, 231 *n*, 254, 349, 354 *n*,
 356 *n*, 360, 362, 503
 Hooper, Bp., 105
 Hope-Scott, Mr., 116
 Horne, Bp., 347

ICONOCLASTS, 461 *n*
 Immaculate conception, 528
 Inclusiveness of the claim to Orders,
 51, 426 *sq.*
 Infallibility, 110, 436, 458
 Injunctions of Mary, 102 *n*
 Innocent VIII., Pope, 187
 „ XI., „ 472
 „ XII., „ 137

Intention, question of, 145 *sq.*, 157,
172 *sq.*, 198, 202, 327 *n.*, 369 *n.*, 487
Irish Protestantism, 131 *n.*, 320 *n.*, 335,
426, 505, 542
Irvingism, 13, 45, 77
Ives, Bp., 123

JACOBITE P. B. of 1604, 219 *n.*, 496

Jacobite High Church movement, 56
Jansenists in Holland, 40 *n.*, 503
Jenner, Bp., 427 *n.*
Jeroboam's schismatical Priesthood,
258
Jerome, St., 468
Jerusalem, Greek Patriarch of, 528
Jewell, Bp., 289 *n.*, 335, 348, 496 *n.*
Jones, Rev. Father, S.J., 263
Judicial office of Bishops, 83
Julius III., Pope, 100
Jurisdiction, 84, 128, 210 *sq.*, 491,
497 *sq.*

KEBLE, Rev. J., 356 *n.*, 357 *n.*

Kellison, 367
Kenrick, Abp., 373
King, Bp., 123 *n.*, 515
Kitchen, Bp., 113

LACROIX, quoted, 163, 247

Lambeth Register, 141, 341, 348
Lancaster, Abp., 321 *n.*, 335
Latimer, Bp., 105
Latin rites, ancient, 162
Laud, Abp., 57, 78 *n.*, 237 *n.*, 334 *n.*,
359, 360
Laxity of the Anglican Church as to
communion, 74
Lay Baptism valid, 203, 206
Leander, Father, 368
Lee, Dr., 126, 127 *n.*, 137, 331 *n.*, 380,
532
Leibnitz, 471
Le Maistre, 372 *n.*
Le Plat, 129 *n.*, 382
Le Quien, 372
Levitical character of the diaconate,
151

Liberalism, 42, 47, 85, 467, 539
Lightfoot, Bp., 501 *n.*
Lingard, Dr., 125, 341, 373
Littledale, Dr., 45, 132, 319, 322,
397, 443 *n.*
Loftus, Abp., 321 *n.*
Lollards, 167
Luther, Martin, 195 *n.*
Lutheranism, 44, 77, 200, 357, 471
Lycurgus, Abp., 531

MAINE, Cuthbert, 123

Manning, Cardinal, 81 *n.*, 409
Manual acts, 201
Marian persecution, 106 *n.*
Marriage of priests, 229
Marshall's "Christian Missions," 536 *n.*
Martène, 14 *n.*, 100 *n.*, 269, 322
Martin, Dr., 148, 195 *n.*
Martinengo, 135
Mary, Queen, 99, 139, 141
Mason's Defence of Anglican Orders,
315, 349, 367
Mass, rejected by the Church of Eng-
land, 52, 59 *n.*, 89, 92, 191, 257
"Mass-priests," 182, 235, 256, 346
Matrimony, Sacrament of, 204
Milman, Dean, 527
Milner, Bp., 127 *n.*
Minor Orders, 149 *sq.*
Mission and jurisdiction, 497 *sq.*
Missionaries, Anglo-Lutheran, 57 *n.*
Molanus, 471
Montagu, Bp., 123 *n.*
"Month," quoted, 26 *n.*, 69 *n.*, 132,
442 *n.*, 479 *n.*
Moravian Orders, 44 *n.*
Morinus, 14 *n.*, 100 *n.*, 269, 371
Morrison, John, 357 *n.*
Mylne, Bp., 209

"NAG'S HEAD" story, 338, 366, 373

Neale, Dr., 527
Newman, Cardinal, quoted, 28, 32,
56 *n.*, 60, 92 *n.*, 376 *n.*, 404 *n.*, 410 *n.*,
517 *sq.*
Nicaea, Second Council of, 461

Noailles, Cardinal de, 124 *n*
 Nonjurors, 60, 137, 360, 526
 Novatian, 177, 332
 Novelty of the Ritualistic position, 94,
 419 *sq.*

OATH taken by Anglican Bishops,
 504 *n*
 "O. C. R.," 70 *n*, 345 *n*, 375 *n*, 453 *sq.*
 Odescalchi, Cardinal, 126
 "Œcumenical Patriarch," 528 *n*
 O'Hart, Bp., 129
 "Old Catholics," 40, 125, 533
 "Order of Communion" 1548, 59 *n*,
 191
 Order, Catholic grades of, 149, 486
 Orders do not constitute a "Church,"
 16 *sq.*, 430
 Ordination, a modern High Church, 65
 " *per saltum*, 284, 485
 Oriental Apostolic Sees, 502, 529
 " *ordination rites*, 162, 165
 "Ornaments Rubric," 492 *sq.*
 Overbeck, Dr., 533

PALLAVICINI, quoted, 133 *n*
 Pallium, the Archbishop's, 287
 Palmer, Mr. W., 529 *n*
 Panzani, 472
 "Papal aggression," 482
 Papal jurisdiction, 509 *n*
 Parker, Abp., 112, 114, 291, 299 *n*,
 316, 324, 334 *sq.*, 507 *n*
 "Parker Society," 168
 Parpaglia, 135
 Patrizi, Cardinal, 265 *n*, 385
 Penance, Sacrament of, 208 *sq.*
 Penitentiary priests, 210
 Perceval, Mr., 319 *n*
 Perrone, quoted, 176, 179 *n*, 187 *n*
 Perry, Rev. G. G., 356 *n*
 Persecution of Catholics, 97 *n*, 352 ; of
 Protestants, 106 *n*
 Personal explanation, 30
 Peter, St., 499
 Peter the Great, 529
 Photius, 462
 Pius IV., Pope, 132, 135

Pius V., St., Pope, 106, 132, 137
 Pius IX., Pope, 481
 Pocock, Mr. Nicholas, 194 *n*
 Pole, Bp., 113
 " *Cardinal*, 99 *sq.*, 139, 142
 Porter, Rev. Father, S.J., 25
 Prayer-book, Anglican and Catholic
 estimates of the, 394
 " 1549, 98, 192 *sq.*
 " 1552, 194 *sq.*, 201, 216 *n*
 " 1558, 110, 227
 " 1604, 219 *n*, 496
 " 1637 (Scotch), 237 *n*
 " 1662, 200, 219 *n*, 238,
 254 *n*, 255 *n*, 301, 359,
 496
 " 1789 (American), 271 *n*
 Prayer of Consecration, 200
 " of Humble Access, 201
 " the form of the Sacraments, 270
 Prejudice, effect of, 407
Presbyter, 148
 " *Presbyter*," 226, 232 *n*
 Presbyterian ordination, 161, 188
 Priesthood, see *Sacerdotium*.
 Private judgment, 474
 Protestant, the Church of England is,
 6 *n*, 240
 Protestant Orders, Foreign, 58 *n*, 146,
 159, 357 *n*, 360 *n*
 " *Pure schismatics*," 459, 479 *n*
 Puritan attacks on Episcopacy, 351 *sq.*
 Pusey, Dr., 271 *n*, 324 *n*, 381, 405 *n*,
 528, 536

"QUARTERLY REVIEW," 359 *n*

RAYNAL, Canon, 103 *n*, 138
 Real Presence, 78 *n*, 199 *sq.*, 203 *n*
 Reformation, the, 49, 96, 109, 167
 " *Reformed Episcopal Church*," 271 *n*,
 426
 Reinkens, Bp., 344
 Renaudot, 272, 372
 Reordination, 104
 Restoration of Charles II., 58
 Reunionism, 5, 523
 Ridley, Bp., 105

Ritual, Anglican, 192
 Ritualism, 65, 67, 79, 425
 Ritualistic laity, 435
 Ritualists, temper of, 13, 421
 "Romish schismatics," 482
 Royal Supremacy, 115, 233, 464 *n*,
 503 *sq*.
 Russian Church, 529, 536
 Ryder, Rev. Father, 443, 468

SACERDOS, 149, 230

Sacerdotium, 142 *sq.*, 185 *sq.*, 487 *sq*.
 "Sacramentarians," 62 *n*
 Sacraments, 119 173, 203 *sq.*, 270
 Sacrifice of the Mass, 59, 89, 92, 196,
 257
 Salmanticenses, 479 *n*
 Sancroft, Abp., 137, 292 *n*, 505
 Sancta Clara, 127, 369, 370 *n*
 Saravia, Dr., 56 *n*, 214, 355 *sq*.
 Sarum rites, 244, 424
 Schoolmen, 141, 269
 Schouvaloff, Rev. P., 536
 Scory, Bp., 104, 113, 317
 Scot, Father William, 516
 Scotch Anglicanism, 237, 286 *n*, 542
 "Scriptural" defence of the Anglican
 Ordinal, 276
 Seabury, Bp., 272 *n*
 Self-ordination of Ritualists, 66 *n*, 428
 Spinola, 472
 Stanley, Dean, 527
 Stole, use of the, 66 *n*
 Stubbs, Canon, 308
 Subdiaconate, 149
 Suffragan Bishops, 317 *n*
 Summary of the argument, 386
Supplices clause, 115, 504
 Supremacy, rejection of the Pope's,
 17 *n*, 92, 97
 Swedish Orders, 38 *n*, 44, 77, 146

TALBOT, Abp., 370

Talleyrand, Prince, 178 *n*
 Tarasius of Constantinople, 285
 Theatrical character of Ritualism, 423
 Theodore of Tarsus, Abp., 409 *n*
 Theological argument, sketch of the,
 118, 168

Thomas Aquinas, St., 186, 369 *n*, 374 *n*
 Tillotson, Abp., 58 *n*
 Togni, Rev. A., 484 *sq*.
 Tondini, Rev. P., 536 *n*
 Tonstall, Bp., 113, 336
 Tournely, 100 *n*, 157, 187 *n*, 270, 323 *n*
 Tract XC., 92, 196, 370 *n*
 Tractarianism, 3, 360, 419
 "Tradition of the instruments," 99,
 102 *n*, 141, 191, 245 *sq.*, 267, 370,
 371 *n*, 488, 521
 Transubstantiation, 200
 Travers, 353 *n*, 357
 Trelawney, Sir Harry, 126
 Trench, Abp., 461 *n*
 Trent, Council of, 128, 174
Tu quoque argument, 522

UNDIVIDED Church," 461

Uniate Churches, 473, 531, 536
 Unity of the Church, 21, 41, 458
 "Unity of the Episcopate," 497 *n*, 529 *n*
 Upsala, Abp. of, 45 *n*
 Urban VIII., Pope, 368

VASQUEZ, quoted, 180

Vatican Council, 463
Veni Creator, 275
 Vincentian rule, 538
 Visitation office, 216, 271 *n*
 Vitalian, Pope, 409 *n*
 Vocation, 169, 399, 486, 497

WAKE, Abp., 56 *n*, 372, 472

Warham, Abp., 409 *n*
 Wesleyanism, 3, 77, 206, 422
 Whitaker, 348 *sq*.
 Whitgift, Abp., 82 *n*, 299, 353 *n*
 Whittingham, Dean, 357 *n*

YOUNG, Bp., 286

ZANCHY, Jerome, 203 *n*, 358

"Zurich Letters," 203 *n*, 289,
 483 *n*, 496 *n*
 Zwinglianism, 62 *n*, 194 *n*, 195, 201,
 216 *n*

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE AND HANSON
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

A LIST OF
C. KEGAN PAUL & CO.'S
PUBLICATIONS.

THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.

A Monthly Review.

EDITED BY JAMES KNOWLES.

Price 2s. 6d.

VOLS. I. & II. PRICE 14s. EACH, VOL. III. 17s., CONTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS
BY THE FOLLOWING WRITERS :—

RABBI HERMANN ADLER.
THE DUKE OF ARGYLL.
ARTHUR ARNOLD.
MATTHEW ARNOLD.
REV. DR. GEORGE PERCY BADGER, D.C.L.
REV. CANON BARRY.
DR. H. CHARLTON BASTIAN.
SIR T. BAZLEY, M.P.
MR. EDGAR BOWRING.
MR. THOMAS BRASSEY, M.P.
REV. J. BALDWIN BROWN.
PROFESSOR GEORGE VON BUNSEN.
DR. W. B. CARPENTER.
PROFESSOR CLIFFORD.
PROFESSOR COLVIN.
REV. R. W. DALE.
MR. EDWARD DICEY.
M. E. GRANT DUFF, M.P.
ARCHIBALD FORBES.
JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.
THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE,
M.P.
THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND
BRISTOL.
MR. W. R. GREG.
MR. FREDERIC HARRISON.
MR. GEORGE J. HOLYOAKE.
MR. R. H. HUTTON.
PROFESSOR HUXLEY.
HENRY IRVING.
SIR JOHN LUBBOCK.

REV. MALCOLM MACCOLL.
REV. A. H. MACKONOCHE.
CARDINAL MANNING.
REV. DR. MARTINEAU.
HIS HIGHNESS MIDHAT PASHA.
PROFESSOR HENRY MORLEY.
RIGHT HON. LYON PLAYFAIR, M.P.
MR. GEORGE POTTER.
W. R. S. RALSTON,
VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE.
PROFESSOR CROOM ROBERTSON.
REV. J. GUINNESS ROGERS.
PROFESSOR RUSKIN.
THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF ST.
PAUL'S.
LORD SELBORNE.
PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH.
JAMES SPEDDING.
RIGHT HON. JAMES STANSFELD, M.P.
SIR JAMES FITZJAMES STEPHEN.
ALFRED TENNYSON.
PROFESSOR TYNDALL.
SIR JULIUS VOGEL.
SIR THOMAS WATSON, M.D.
DR. WARD.
MR. FREDERICK WEDMORE.
THE VERY REV. THE DEAN OF WEST-
MINSTER.
MAJOR-GEN. SIR GARNET WOLSELEY.
THE RIGHT HON. CHAS. WORDSWORTH.
&c. &c.

1 Paternoster Square,
London.

A LIST OF
C. KEGAN PAUL & CO.'S
PUBLICATIONS.

~~~~~

*ABDULLA (Hakayit)*—AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A MALAY MUNSHI. Translated by J. T. THOMSON, F.R.G.S. With Photo-lithograph Page of Abdulla's MS. Post 8vo. price 12s.

*ADAMS (A. L.) M.A., M.B., F.R.S., F.G.S.*—FIELD AND FOREST RAMBLES OF A NATURALIST IN NEW BRUNSWICK. With Notes and Observations on the Natural History of Eastern Canada. Illustrated. 8vo. price 14s.

*ADAMS (F. O.) F.R.G.S.*—THE HISTORY OF JAPAN. From the Earliest Period to the Present Time. New Edition, revised. 2 volumes. With Maps and Plans. Demy 8vo. price 21s. each.

*A. K. H. B.*—A SCOTCH COMMUNION SUNDAY, to which are added Certain Discourses from a University City. By the Author of 'The Recreations of a Country Parson.' Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

FROM A QUIET PLACE. A New Volume of Sermons. Crown 8vo. cloth.

*ALBERT (Mary)*.—HOLLAND AND HER HEROES TO THE YEAR 1585. An Adaptation from 'Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic.' Small crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

*ALLEN (Rev. R.) M.A.*—ABRAHAM ; HIS LIFE, TIMES, AND TRAVELS, 3,800 years ago. With Map. Second Edition. Post 8vo. price 6s.

*ALLEN (Grant) B.A.*—PHYSIOLOGICAL ÆSTHETICS. Large post 8vo. 9s.

*ANDERSON (Rev. C.) M.A.*—NEW READINGS OF OLD PARABLES. Demy 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

CHURCH THOUGHT AND CHURCH WORK. Edited by. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THE CURATE OF SHYRE. Second Edition. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*ANDERSON (R. C.) C.E.*—TABLES FOR FACILITATING THE CALCULATION OF EVERY DETAIL IN CONNECTION WITH EARTHEN AND MASONRY DAMS. Royal 8vo. price £2. 2s.

*ARCHER (Thomas)*—ABOUT MY FATHER'S BUSINESS. Work amidst the Sick, the Sad, and the Sorrowing. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

*ARNOLD (Arthur)*—SOCIAL POLITICS. Demy 8vo. cloth.

*BAGEHOT (Walter)*—THE ENGLISH CONSTITUTION. A New Edition, Revised and Corrected, with an Introductory Dissertation on Recent Changes and Events. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

LOMBARD STREET. A Description of the Money Market. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SOME ARTICLES ON THE DEPRECIATION OF SILVER, AND TOPICS CONNECTED WITH IT. Demy 8vo. price 5s.

*BAGOT (Alan)*—ACCIDENTS IN MINES: Their Causes and Prevention. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*BAKER (Sir Sherston, Bart.)*—HALLECK'S INTERNATIONAL LAW; or, Rules Regulating the Intercourse of States in Peace and War. A New Edition, revised, with Notes and Cases. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 38s.

*BALDWIN (Capt. J. H.) F.Z.S. Bengal Staff Corps.*—THE LARGE AND SMALL GAME OF BENGAL AND THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA. 4to. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Price 21s.

*BARNES (William)*—AN OUTLINE OF ENGLISH SPEECHCRAFT. Crown 8vo. price 4s.

*BARTLEY (G. C. T.)*—DOMESTIC ECONOMY: Thrift in Every-Day Life. Taught in Dialogues suitable for children of all ages. Small Cr. 8vo. price 2s.

*BAUR (Ferdinand) Dr. Ph., Professor in Maulbronn.*—A PHILOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION TO GREEK AND LATIN FOR STUDENTS. Translated and adapted from the German. By C. KEGAN PAUL, M.A. Oxon., and the Rev. E. D. STONE, M.A., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master at Eton. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*BAYNES (Rev. Canon R. H.)*—AT THE COMMUNION TIME. A Manual for Holy Communion. With a preface by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Cloth, price 1s. 6d.

*BECKER (Bernard H.)*—THE SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES OF LONDON. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

*BELLINGHAM (Henry) Barrister-at-Law*—SOCIAL ASPECTS OF CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM IN THEIR CIVIL BEARING UPON NATIONS. Translated and adapted from the French of M. le Baron de Haulleville. With a preface by His Eminence Cardinal Manning. Crown 8vo price 6s.

*BENNIE (Rev. J. N.) M.A.*—THE ETERNAL LIFE. Sermons preached during the last twelve years. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*BERNARD (Bayle)*—SAMUEL LOVER, HIS LIFE AND UNPUBLISHED WORKS. In 2 vols. With a Steel Portrait. Post 8vo. price 21s.

*BISCOE (A. C.)*—THE EARLS OF MIDDLETON, Lords of Clermont and of Fettercairn, and the Middleton Family. Crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

*BISSET (A.)*—HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

*BLANC (H.) M.D.*—CHOLERA: HOW TO AVOID AND TREAT IT. Popular and Practical Notes. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

*BONWICK (J.) F.R.G.S.*—PYRAMID FACTS AND FANCIES. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

EGYPTIAN BELIEF AND MODERN THOUGHT. Large Post 8vo. cloth, price 10s. 6a.

*BOWEN (H. C.) M.A., Head Master of the Grocers' Company's Middle Class School at Hackney.*

STUDIES IN ENGLISH, for the use of Modern Schools. Small crown 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

*BOWRING (L.) C.S.I.—EASTERN EXPERIENCES.* Illustrated with Maps and Diagrams. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

*BOWRING (Sir John).—AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL RECOLLECTIONS OF SIR JOHN BOWRING.* With Memoir by LEWIN B. BOWRING. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

*BRADLEY (F. H.)—ETHICAL STUDIES.* Critical Essays in Moral Philosophy. Large post 8vo. price 9s.

MR. SIDGWICK'S HEDONISM : an Examination of the Main Argument of 'The Methods of Ethics.' Demy 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

*BROOKE (Rev. S. A.) M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to Her Majesty the Queen, and Minister of Bedford Chapel, Bloomsbury.*

LIFE AND LETTERS OF THE LATE REV. F. W. ROBERTSON, M.A., Edited by.

I. Uniform with the Sermons. 2 vols. With Steel Portrait. Price 7s. 6d.

II. Library Edition. 8vo. With Two Steel Portraits. Price 12s.

III. A Popular Edition. In 1 vol. 8vo. price 6s.

THE FIGHT OF FAITH. Sermons preached on various occasions. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THEOLOGY IN THE ENGLISH POETS.—Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Burns. Third Edition. Post 8vo. price 9s.

CHRIST IN MODERN LIFE. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

SERMONS. First Series. Ninth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SERMONS. Second Series. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s.

FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE : The Life and Work of. A Memorial Sermon. Crown 8vo. sewed, price 1s.

*BROOKE (W. G.) M.A.—THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.* With a Classified Statement of its Provisions, Notes, and Index. Third Edition, revised and corrected. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SIX PRIVY COUNCIL JUDGMENTS—1850-72. Annotated by. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 9s.

*BROUN (J. A.)—MAGNETIC OBSERVATIONS AT TREVANDRUM AND AUGUSTIA MALLEY.* Vol. I. 4to. price 63s.

The Report from above, separately sewed, price 21s.

*BROWN (Rev. J. Baldwin) B.A.—THE HIGHER LIFE.* Its Reality Experience, and Destiny. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE GOSPEL OF LOVE. Five Discourses. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

*BROWN (J. Croumbie) LL.D.—REBOISEMENT IN FRANCE ; or, Records of the Replanting of the Alps, the Cevennes, and the Pyrenees with Trees, Herbage, and Bush.* Demy 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

THE HYDROLOGY OF SOUTHERN AFRICA. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.



- BROWNE (Rev. M. E.)*—UNTIL THE DAY DAWN. Four Advent Lectures. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- BURCKHARDT (Jacob)*—THE CIVILIZATION OF THE PERIOD OF THE RENAISSANCE IN ITALY. Authorised translation, by S. G. C. Middlemore. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.
- BURTON (Mrs. Richard)*—THE INNER LIFE OF SYRIA, PALESTINE, AND THE HOLY LAND. With Maps, Photographs, and Coloured Plates. 2 vols. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 24s.
- BURTON (Capt. Richard F.)*—THE GOLD MINES OF MIDIAN AND THE RUINED MIDIANITE CITIES. A Fortnight's Tour in North Western Arabia. With numerous illustrations. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 18s.
- CARLISLE (A. D.) B.A.*—ROUND THE WORLD IN 1870. A Volume of Travels, with Maps. New and Cheaper Edition. Demy 8vo. price 6s.
- CARNE (Miss E. T.)*—THE REALM OF TRUTH. Crown 8vo. price 5s. 6d.
- CARPENTER (W. B.) LL.D., M.D., F.R.S., &c.*—THE PRINCIPLES OF MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY. With their Applications to the Training and Discipline of the Mind, and the Study of its Morbid Conditions. Illustrated. Fourth Edition. 8vo. price 12s.
- CHILDREN'S TOYS, and some Elementary Lessons in General Knowledge which they Teach. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- CHRISTOPHERSON (The Late Rev. Henry) M.A.*  
SERMONS. With an Introduction by John Rae, LL.D., F.S.A. Second Series. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- CLODD (Edward) F.R.A.S.*—THE CHILDHOOD OF THE WORLD: a Simple Account of Man in Early Times. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s.  
A Special Edition for Schools. Price 1s.
- THE CHILDHOOD OF RELIGIONS. Including a Simple Account of the Birth and Growth of Myths and Legends. Third Thousand. Crown 8vo. price 5s.  
A Special Edition for Schools. Price 1s. 6d.
- COLERIDGE (Sara)*—PHANTASMION. A Fairy Tale. With an Introductory Preface by the Right Hon. Lord Coleridge, of Ottery St. Mary. A New Edition. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MEMOIR AND LETTERS OF SARA COLERIDGE. Edited by her Daughter. With Index. 2 vols. With Two Portraits. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Crown 8vo. price 24s.  
Cheap Edition. With one Portrait. Price 7s. 6d.
- COLLINS (Rev. R.) M.A.*—MISSIONARY ENTERPRISE IN THE EAST. With special reference to the Syrian Christians of Malabar, and the Results of Modern Missions. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- COOKE (Prof. J. P.) of the Harvard University.*—SCIENTIFIC CULTURE. Crown 8vo. price 1s.
- COOPER (T. T.) F.R.G.S.*—THE MISHMEE HILLS: an Account of a Journey made in an Attempt to Penetrate Thibet from Assam, to open New Routes for Commerce. Second Edition. With Four Illustrations and Map. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

- CORY (Lieut.-Col. Arthur)*—THE EASTERN MENACE ; OR, SHADOWS OF COMING EVENTS. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- COX (Rev. Sir George W.) M.A., Bart.*—A HISTORY OF GREECE FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE END OF THE PERSIAN WAR. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 36s.
- THE MYTHOLOGY OF THE ARYAN NATIONS. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 28s.
- A GENERAL HISTORY OF GREECE FROM THE EARLIEST PERIOD TO THE DEATH OF ALEXANDER THE GREAT, with a sketch of the subsequent History to the present time. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- TALES OF ANCIENT GREECE. Third Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 6s.
- SCHOOL HISTORY OF GREECE. With Maps. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- THE GREAT PERSIAN WAR FROM THE HISTORY OF HERODOTUS. New Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- A MANUAL OF MYTHOLOGY IN THE FORM OF QUESTION AND ANSWER. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s.
- COX (Rev. Samuel)*—SALVATOR MUNDI ; or, Is Christ the Saviour of all Men ? Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- CROMPTON (Henry)* — INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- CURWEN (Henry)*—SORROW AND SONG ; Studies of Literary Struggle. Henry Münger—Novalis—Alexander Petöfi—Honoré de Balzac—Edgar Allan Poe—André Chénier. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 15s.
- DANCE (Rev. C. D.)*—RECOLLECTIONS OF FOUR YEARS IN VENEZUELA. With Three Illustrations and a Map. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- DAVIDSON (Rev. Samuel) D.D., LL.D.*—THE NEW TESTAMENT, TRANSLATED FROM THE LATEST GREEK TEXT OF TISCHENDORF. A New and thoroughly revised Edition. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- CANON OF THE BIBLE : Its Formation, History, and Fluctuations. Second Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.
- DAVIES (G. Christopher)*—MOUNTAIN, MEADOW, AND MERE : a Series of Outdoor Sketches of Sport, Scenery, Adventures, and Natural History With Sixteen Illustrations by Bosworth W. Harcourt. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- DAVIES (Rev. J. L.) M.A.*—THEOLOGY AND MORALITY. Essays on Questions of Belief and Practice. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- DAWSON (Geo.), M.A.*—PRAYERS, WITH A DISCOURSE ON PRAYER. Edited by his Wife. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. 6s.
- SERMONS ON DISPUTED POINTS AND SPECIAL OCCASIONS. Edited by his Wife. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- SERMONS ON DAILY LIFE AND DUTY. Edited by his Wife. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- DE LESSEPS (Ferdinand)*—THE SUEZ CANAL : Letters Descriptive of its Rise and Progress in 1854-1856. Translated by N. R. D'ANVERS. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

- DE REDCLIFFE* (*Viscount Stratford*) *P.C., K.G., G.C.B.*—WHY AM I A CHRISTIAN? Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s.
- DESPREZ* (*Philip S.*) *B.D.*—DANIEL AND JOHN. Demy 8vo. cloth.
- DE TOCQUEVILLE* (*A.*)—CORRESPONDENCE AND CONVERSATIONS OF, WITH NASSAU WILLIAM SENIOR, from 1834 to 1859. Edited by M. C. M. SIMPSON. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 21s.
- DOWDEN* (*Edward*) *LL.D.*—SHAKSPERE: a Critical Study of his Mind and Art. Third Edition. Post 8vo. price 12s.
- STUDIES IN LITERATURE, 1789–1877. Large Post 8vo. price 12s.
- DREW* (*Rev. G. S.*) *M.A.*—SCRIPTURE LANDS IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR HISTORY. Second Edition. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- NAZARETH: ITS LIFE AND LESSONS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- THE DIVINE KINGDOM ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN. 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- THE SON OF MAN: His Life and Ministry. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- DREWRY* (*G. O.*) *M.D.*—THE COMMON-SENSE MANAGEMENT OF THE STOMACH. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- DREWRY* (*G. O.*) *M.D., and BARTLETT* (*H. C.*) *Ph.D., F.C.S.*  
CUP AND PLATTER: or, Notes on Food and its Effects. Small 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- EDEN* (*Frederick*)—THE NILE WITHOUT A DRAGOMAN. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- ELSDALE* (*Henry*)—STUDIES IN TENNYSON'S IDYLLS. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- ESSAYS ON THE ENDOWMENT OF RESEARCH. By Various Writers.  
*List of Contributors.*—Mark Pattison, B.D.—James S. Cotton, B.A.—Charles E. Appleton, D.C.L.—Archibald H. Sayce, M.A.—Henry Clifton Sorby, F.R.S.—Thomas K. Cheyne, M.A.—W. T. Thiselton Dyer, M.A.—Henry Nettleship, M.A. Square crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- EVANS* (*Mark*)—THE STORY OF OUR FATHER'S LOVE, told to Children. being a New and Cheaper Edition. With Four Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.
- A BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER AND WORSHIP FOR HOUSEHOLD USE, compiled exclusively from the Holy Scriptures. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- THE GOSPEL OF HOME LIFE. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.
- EX-CIVILIAN.*—LIFE IN THE MOFUSSIL: or Civilian Life in Lower Bengal. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 14s.
- FAVRE* (*Mons. J.*)—THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEFENCE. From the 30th June to the 31st October, 1870. Translated by H. CLARK. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.



- FINN (The late James) M.R.A.S.*—STIRRING TIMES ; or, Records from Jerusalem Consular Chronicles of 1853 to 1856. Edited and Compiled by his Widow ; with a Preface by the Viscountess STRANGFORD. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 30s.
- FLEMING (James) D.D.*—EARLY CHRISTIAN WITNESSES; or, Testimonies of the First Centuries to the Truth of Christianity. Small Crown 8vo. cloth.
- FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE : the Arguments, Proceedings, Judgment, and Report. Demy 8vo. price 25s.
- FOOTMAN (Rev. H.) M.A.*—FROM HOME AND BACK ; or, Some Aspects of Sin as seen in the Light of the Parable of the Prodigal. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- FOWLE (Rev. Edmund)*—LATIN PRIMER RULES MADE EASY. Crown 8vo. price 3s.
- FOWLE (Rev. T. W.) M.A.*—THE RECONCILIATION OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE. Being Essays on Immortality, Inspiration, Miracles, and the Being of Christ. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- FOX-BOURNE (H. R.)*—THE LIFE OF JOHN LOCKE, 1632-1704. 2 vols. demy 8vo. price 28s.
- FRASER (Donald)*—EXCHANGE TABLES OF STERLING AND INDIAN RUPEE CURRENCY, upon a new and extended system, embracing Values from One Farthing to One Hundred Thousand Pounds, and at rates progressing, in Sixteenths of a Penny, from 1s. 9d. to 2s. 3d. per Rupee. Royal 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- FRISWELL (J. Hain)*—THE BETTER SELF. Essays for Home Life. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- FYTCH (Lieut.-Gen. Albert) C.S.I. late Chief Commissioner of British Burma* BURMA PAST AND PRESENT, with Personal Reminiscences of the Country. With Steel Portraits, Chromolithographs, Engravings on Wood, and Map. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 30s.
- GAMBIER (Capt. J. W.) R.N.*—SERVIA. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- GARDNER (J.) M.D.*—LONGEVITY : THE MEANS OF PROLONGING LIFE AFTER MIDDLE AGE. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. Small crown 8vo. price 4s
- GILBERT (Mrs.)*—AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND OTHER MEMORIALS. Edited by Josiah Gilbert. Third and Cheaper Edition. With Steel Portrait and several Wood Engravings. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- GILL (Rev. W. W.) B.A.*—MYTHS AND SONGS FROM THE SOUTH PACIFIC. With a Preface by F. Max Müller, M.A., Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. Post 8vo. price 9s.
- GODKIN (James)*—THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF IRELAND : Primitive, Papal, and Protestant. Including the Evangelical Missions, Catholic Agitations, and Church Progress of the last half Century. 8vo. price 12s.
- GODWIN (William)*—WILLIAM GODWIN: HIS FRIENDS AND CONTEMPORARIES. With Portraits and Facsimiles of the Handwriting of Godwin and his Wife. By C. KEGAN PAUL. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 28s.
- THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY UNVEILED. Being Essays never before published. Edited, with a Preface, by C. Kegan Paul. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.



*GOODENOUGH (Commodore J. G.) R.N., C.B., C.M.G.*—MEMOIR OF, with Extracts from his Letters and Journals. Edited by his Widow. With Steel Engraved Portrait. Square 8vo. cloth, 5s.

\*\* Also a Library Edition with Maps, Woodcuts, and Steel Engraved Portrait. Square post 8vo. price 14s.

*GOODMAN (W.)* CUBA, THE PEARL OF THE ANTILLES. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*GOULD (Rev. S. Baring) M.A.*—THE VICAR OF MORWENSTOW: a Memoir of the Rev. R. S. Hawker. With Portrait. Third Edition, revised. Square post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

*GRANVILLE (A. B.) M.D., F.R.S., &c.*—AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A. B. GRANVILLE, F.R.S., &c. Edited, with a Brief Account of the Concluding Years of his Life, by his youngest Daughter, Paulina B. Granville. 2 vols. With a Portrait. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 32s.

*GREY (John) of Dilston.*—MEMOIRS. By JOSEPHINE E. BUTLER. New and Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*GRIFFITH (Rev. T.) A.M.*—STUDIES OF THE DIVINE MASTER. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

*GRIFFITHS (Capt. Arthur)*—MEMORIALS OF MILLBANK, AND CHAPTERS IN PRISON HISTORY. With Illustrations by R. Goff and the Author. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 21s.

*GRIMLEY (Rev. H. N.) M.A., Professor of Mathematics in the University College of Wales, and sometime Chaplain of Tremadoc Church.*

TREMADOC SERMONS, CHIEFLY ON THE SPIRITUAL BODY, THE UNSEEN WORLD, AND THE DIVINE HUMANITY. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*GRÜNER (M. L.)*—STUDIES OF BLAST FURNACE PHENOMENA. Translated by L. D. B. GORDON, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*GURNEY (Rev. Archer)*—WORDS OF FAITH AND CHEER. A Mission of Instruction and Suggestion. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*HAECKEL (Prof. Ernst)*—THE HISTORY OF CREATION. Translation revised by Professor E. RAY LANKESTER, M.A., F.R.S. With Coloured Plates and Genealogical Trees of the various groups of both plants and animals. 2 vols. Second Edition. Post 8vo. cloth, price 32s.

THE HISTORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF MAN. With numerous Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

*HAKE (A. Egmont)*—PARIS ORIGINALS, with Twenty Etchings, by LÉON RICHTON. Large post 8vo. price 14s.

*HALLECK'S* INTERNATIONAL LAW; or, Rules Regulating the Inter-course of States in Peace and War. A New Edition, revised, with Notes and Cases, by Sir SHERSTON BAKER, Bart. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 38s.

*HARCOURT (Capt. A. F. P.)*—THE SHAKESPEARE ARGOSY. Containing much of the wealth of Shakespeare's Wisdom and Wit, alphabetically arranged and classified. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*HAWEIS (Rev. H. R.) M.A.*—CURRENT COIN. Materialism—The Devil—Crime—Drunkenness—Pauperism—Emotion—Recreation—The Sabbath. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SPEECH IN SEASON. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 9s.

THOUGHTS FOR THE TIMES. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

UNSECTARIAN FAMILY PRAYERS for Morning and Evening for a Week, with short selected passages from the Bible. Second Edition. Square crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

ARROWS IN THE AIR. Conferences and Pleas. Crown 8vo. cloth.

*HAYMAN (H.) D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School.*—RUGBY SCHOOL SERMONS. With an Introductory Essay on the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*HELLWALD (Baron F. Von)*—THE RUSSIANS IN CENTRAL ASIA. A Critical Examination, down to the Present Time, of the Geography and History of Central Asia. Translated by Lieut.-Col. Theodore Wirgman, LL.B. With Map. Large post 8vo. price 12s.

*HINTON (J.)*—THE PLACE OF THE PHYSICIAN. To which is added ESSAYS ON THE LAW OF HUMAN LIFE, AND ON THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ORGANIC AND INORGANIC WORLDS. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

PHYSIOLOGY FOR PRACTICAL USE. By Various Writers. With 50 Illustrations. 2 vols. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 12s. 6d.

AN ATLAS OF DISEASES OF THE MEMBRANA TYMPANI. With Descriptive Text. Post 8vo. price £6. 6s.

THE QUESTIONS OF AURAL SURGERY. With Illustrations. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price £6. 6s.

LIFE AND LETTERS. Edited by ELLICE HOPKINS, with an Introduction by Sir W. W. GULL, Bart., and Portrait engraved on Steel by C. H. JEENS. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

CHAPTERS ON THE ART OF THINKING, and other Essays. Crown 8vo.

*H. J. C.*—THE ART OF FURNISHING. A Popular Treatise on the Principles of Furnishing, based on the Laws of Common Sense, Requirement, and Picturesque Effect. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*HOLROYD (Major W. R. M.)*—TAS-HIL UL KALAM ; or, Hindustani made Easy. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

*HOOPER (Mary)*—LITTLE DINNERS : HOW TO SERVE THEM WITH ELEGANCE AND ECONOMY. Thirteenth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

COOKERY FOR INVALIDS, PERSONS OF DELICATE DIGESTION, AND CHILDREN. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

EVERY-DAY MEALS. Being Economical and Wholesome Recipes for Breakfast, Luncheon, and Supper. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

*HOPKINS (Ellice)*—LIFE AND LETTERS OF JAMES HINTON, with an Introduction by Sir W. W. GULL, Bart., and Portrait engraved on Steel by C. H. JEENS. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

*HOPKINS (M.)*—THE PORT OF REFUGE ; or, Counsel and Aid to Shipmasters in Difficulty, Doubt, or Distress. Second and Revised Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

- HORNE (William) M.A.*—REASON AND REVELATION : an Examination into the Nature and Contents of Scripture Revelation, as compared with other Forms of Truth. Demy 8vo. price 12s.
- HORNER (The Misses)*—WALKS IN FLORENCE. A New and thoroughly Revised Edition. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. Cloth limp. With Illustrations.  
VOL. I.—Churches, Streets, and Palaces. Price 10s. 6d.  
VOL. II.—Public Galleries and Museums. Price 5s.
- HULL (Edmund C. P.)*—THE EUROPEAN IN INDIA. With a Medical Guide for Anglo-Indians. By R. S. MAIR, M.D., F.R.C.S.E. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Post 8vo. price 6s.
- HUTTON (James)*—MISSIONARY LIFE IN THE SOUTHERN SEAS. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- JACKSON (T. G.)*—MODERN GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- JACOB (Maj.-Gen. Sir G. Le Grand) K.C.S.I., C.B.*—WESTERN INDIA BEFORE AND DURING THE MUTINIES. Pictures drawn from Life. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- JENKINS (E.) and RAYMOND (J.) Esqs.*—A LEGAL HANDBOOK FOR ARCHITECTS, BUILDERS, AND BUILDING OWNERS. Second Edition, Revised. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- JENKINS (Rev. R. C.) M.A.*—THE PRIVILEGE OF PETER and the Claims of the Roman Church confronted with the Scriptures, the Councils, and the Testimony of the Popes themselves. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- JENNINGS (Mrs. Vaughan)*—RAHEL : HER LIFE AND LETTERS. With a Portrait from the Painting by Daffinger. Square post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- JONES (Lucy)*—PUDDINGS AND SWEETS ; being Three Hundred and Sixty-five Receipts approved by experience. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- KAUFMANN (Rev. M.) B.A.*—SOCIALISM : Its Nature, its Dangers, and its Remedies considered. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- KERNER (Dr. A.) Professor of Botany in the University of Innsbruck.*—FLOWERS AND THEIR UNBIDDEN GUESTS. Translation edited by W. OGLE, M.A., M.B. With Illustrations. Square 8vo. cloth.
- KIDD (Joseph) M.D.*—THE LAWS OF THERAPEUTICS ; or, the Science and Art of Medicine. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- KINAHAN (G. Henry) M.R.I.A., of H.M.'s Geological Survey.*—THE GEOLOGY OF IRELAND, with numerous Illustrations and a Geological Map of Ireland. Square 8vo. cloth.
- KING (Alice)*—A CLUSTER OF LIVES. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- KINGSLEY (Charles) M.A.*—LETTERS AND MEMORIES OF HIS LIFE. Edited by his WIFE. With Two Steel Engraved Portraits, and Illustrations on Wood, and a Facsimile of his Handwriting. Thirteenth Edition. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 36s.
- ALL SAINTS' DAY, and other Sermons. Edited by the Rev. W. HARRISON. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- TRUE WORDS FOR BRAVE MEN. A Book for Soldiers' and Sailors' Libraries. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.



- LACORDAIRE* (*Rev. Père*)—LIFE : Conferences delivered at Toulouse. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- LAMBERT* (*Cowley*) *F.R.G.S.*—A TRIP TO CASHMERE AND LADAK. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- LAURIE* (*J. S.*)—EDUCATIONAL COURSE OF SECULAR SCHOOL BOOKS FOR INDIA :—  
THE FIRST HINDUSTANI READER. Stiff linen wrapper, price 6d.  
THE SECOND HINDUSTANI READER. Stiff linen wrapper, price 6d.  
THE ORIENTAL (ENGLISH) READER. Book I., price 6d. ; II., price 7½d. ; III., price 9d. ; IV., price 1s.  
GEOGRAPHY OF INDIA ; with Maps and Historical Appendix, tracing the Growth of the British Empire in Hindustan. Fcap. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.
- L. D. S.*—LETTERS FROM CHINA AND JAPAN. With Illustrated Title-page. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- LEE* (*Rev. F. G.*) *D.C.L.*—THE OTHER WORLD; or, Glimpses of the Supernatural. 2 vols. A New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 15s.
- LENOIR* (*J.*)—FAYOUM ; or, Artists in Egypt. A Tour with M. Gérôme and others. With 13 Illustrations. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- LIFE IN THE MOFUSSIL ; or, Civilian Life in Lower Bengal. By an Ex-Civilian. Large post 8vo. price 14s.
- LINDSAY* (*W. Lauder*) *M.D., F.R.S.E., &c.*—MIND IN THE LOWER ANIMALS IN HEALTH AND DISEASE. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. cloth.  
Vol. I.—Mind in Health. Vol. II.—Mind in Disease.
- LORIMER* (*Peter*) *D.D.*—JOHN KNOX AND THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. His Work in her Pulpit, and his Influence upon her Liturgy, Articles, and Parties. Demy 8vo. price 12s.
- JOHN WICLIF AND HIS ENGLISH PRECURSORS. By GERHARD VICTOR LECHLER. Translated from the German, with additional Notes. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 21s.
- LOTHIAN* (*Roxburghe*)—DANTE AND BEATRICE FROM 1282 TO 1290. A Romance. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 24s.
- LOVER* (*Samuel*) *R.H.A.*—THE LIFE OF SAMUEL LOVER, *R.H.A.* ; Artistic, Literary, and Musical. With Selections from his Unpublished Papers and Correspondence. By BAYLE BERNARD. 2 vols. With a Portrait. Post 8vo. price 21s.
- LYONS* (*R. T.*) *Surg.-Maj. Bengal Army.*—A TREATISE ON RELAPSING FEVER. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MACAULAY* (*J.*) *M.D. Edin.*—THE TRUTH ABOUT IRELAND : Tours of Observation in 1872 and 1875. With Remarks on Irish Public Questions. Being a Second Edition of 'Ireland in 1872,' with a New and Supplementary Preface. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- MACLACHLAN* (*A. N. C.*) *M.A.*—WILLIAM AUGUSTUS, DUKE OF CUMBERLAND : being a Sketch of his Military Life and Character, chiefly as exhibited in the General Orders of His Royal Highness, 1745-1747. With Illustrations. Post 8vo. price 15s.



- MACNAUGHT (Rev. John)*—*ÆNA DOMINI*: An Essay on the Lord's Supper, its Primitive Institution, Apostolic Uses, and Subsequent History. Demy 8vo. price 14s.
- MAIR (R. S.) M.D., F.R.C.S.E.*—*THE MEDICAL GUIDE FOR ANGLO INDIANS*. Being a Compendium of Advice to Europeans in India, relating to the Preservation and Regulation of Health. With a Supplement on the Management of Children in India. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. limp cloth price 3s. 6d.
- MANNING (His Eminence Cardinal)*—*ESSAYS ON RELIGION AND LITERATURE*. By various Writers. Third Series. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE HOLY SEE*. With an Appendix containing the Papal Allocution and a translation. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- THE TRUE STORY OF THE VATICAN COUNCIL*. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- MARRIOTT (Maj.-Gen. W. F.) C.S.I.*—*A GRAMMAR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY*. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- MAUGHAN (W. C.)*—*THE ALPS OF ARABIA*; or, Travels through Egypt, Sinai, Arabia, and the Holy Land. With Map. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 5s.
- MAURICE (C. E.)*—*LIVES OF ENGLISH POPULAR LEADERS*. No. 1.—STEPHEN LANGTON. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d. No. 2.—TYLER, BALL, and OLDCASTLE. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MAZZINI (Joseph)*—*A Memoir*. By E. A. V. Two Photographic Portraits. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- MEDLEY (Lieut.-Col. J. G.) R.E.*—*AN AUTUMN TOUR IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA*. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- MICKLETHWAITE (J. T.) F.S.A.*—*MODERN PARISH CHURCHES*: Their Plan, Design, and Furniture. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MILLER (Edward)*—*THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF IRVINGISM*; or, the so-called Catholic and Apostolic Church. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 25s.
- MILNE (James)*—*TABLES OF EXCHANGE* for the Conversion of Sterling Money into Indian and Ceylon Currency, at Rates from 1s. 8d. to 2s. 3d. per Rupee. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. Cloth, price £2. 2s.
- MIVART (St. George) F.R.S.*—*CONTEMPORARY EVOLUTION*: An Essay on some recent Social Changes. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MOCKLER (E.)*—*A GRAMMAR OF THE BALOOCHEE LANGUAGE*, as it is spoken in Makran (Ancient Gedrosia), in the Persia-Arabic and Roman characters. Fcap. 8vo. price 5s.
- MOFFAT (R. S.)*—*ECONOMY OF CONSUMPTION*: a Study in Political Economy. Demy 8vo. price 18s.
- THE PRINCIPLES OF A TIME POLICY*: being an Exposition of a Method of Settling Disputes between Employers and Employed in regard to Time and Wages, by a simple Process of Mercantile Barter, without recourse to Strikes or Locks-out. Reprinted from 'The Economy of Consumption,' with a Preface and Appendix containing Observations on some Reviews of that book, and a Re-criticism of the Theories of Ricardo and J. S. Mill on Rent, Value, and Cost of Production. Demy 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*MOLTKE (Field-Marshal Von)*—LETTERS FROM RUSSIA. Translated by ROBINA NAPIER. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*MOORE (Rev. D.) M.A.*—CHRIST AND HIS CHURCH. By the Author of 'The Age and the Gospel,' &c. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*MORE (R. Jasper)*—UNDER THE BALKANS. Notes of a Visit to the District of Philippopolis in 1876. With a Map, and Illustrations from Photographs. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*MORELL (J. R.)*—EUCLID SIMPLIFIED IN METHOD AND LANGUAGE. Being a Manual of Geometry. Compiled from the most important French Works, approved by the University of Paris and the Minister of Public Instruction. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

*MORSE (E. S.) Ph.D.*—FIRST BOOK OF ZOOLOGY. With numerous Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

*MUSGRAVE (Anthony)*—STUDIES IN POLITICAL ECONOMY. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*NEWMAN (J. H.) D.D.*—CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF. Being Selections from his various Works. Arranged with the Author's personal Approval. Third Edition. With Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

\* \* A Portrait of the Rev. Dr. J. H. Newman, mounted for framing, can be had price 2s. 6d.

*NICHOLAS (T.)*—THE PEDIGREE OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE. Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

*NOBLE (J. A.)*—THE PELICAN PAPERS. Reminiscences and Remains of a Dweller in the Wilderness. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*NORMAN PEOPLE (THE)*, and their Existing Descendants in the British Dominions and the United States of America. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

*NOITREGE (John) A.M.*—THE SPIRITUAL FUNCTION OF A PRESBYTER IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. Crown 8vo. red edges, price 3s. 6d.

*O'MEARA (Kathleen.)*—FREDERIC OZANAM, Professor of the Sorbonne: His Life and Work. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth.

*ORIENTAL SPORTING MAGAZINE (THE)*. A Reprint of the first 5 Volumes, in 2 Volumes. Demy 8vo. price 28s.

*PARKER (Joseph) D.D.*—THE PARACLETE: An Essay on the Personality and Ministry of the Holy Ghost, with some reference to current discussions. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

*PARSLOE (Joseph)*—OUR RAILWAYS. Sketches, Historical and Descriptive. With Practical Information as to Fares and Rates, &c., and a Chapter on Railway Reform. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*PARR (Harriet)*—ECHOES OF A FAMOUS YEAR. Crown 8vo. price 8s. 6d.

*PAUL (C. Kegan)*—WILLIAM GODWIN: HIS FRIENDS AND CONTEMPORARIES. With Portraits and Facsimiles of the Handwriting of Godwin and his Wife. 2 vols. Square post 8vo. price 28s.

THE GENIUS OF CHRISTIANITY UNVEILED. Being Essays by William Godwin never before published. Edited, with a Preface, by C. Kegan Paul. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*PAYNE (Prof. J. F.)*—LECTURES ON EDUCATION. Price 6*d.* each.

II. Fröbel and the Kindergarten System. Second Edition.

A VISIT TO GERMAN SCHOOLS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN GERMANY. Notes of a Professional Tour to inspect some of the Kindergartens, Primary Schools, Public Girls' Schools, and Schools for Technical Instruction in Hamburgh, Berlin, Dresden, Weimar, Gotha, Eisenach, in the autumn of 1874. With Critical Discussions of the General Principles and Practice of Kindergartens and other Schemes of Elementary Education. Crown 8vo. price 4*s.* 6*d.*

*PENRICE (Maj. J.) B.A.*—A DICTIONARY AND GLOSSARY OF THE KO-RAN. With Copious Grammatical References and Explanations of the Text. 4to. price 21*s.*

*PERCEVAL (Rev. P.)*—TAMIL PROVERBS, WITH THEIR ENGLISH TRANSLATION. Containing upwards of Six Thousand Proverbs. Third Edition. Demy 8vo. sewed, price 9*s.*

*PESCHEL (Dr. Oscar)*—THE RACES OF MAN AND THEIR GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION. Large crown 8vo. price 9*s.*

*PIGGOT (J.) F.S.A., F.R.G.S.*—PERSIA—ANCIENT AND MODERN. Post 8vo. price 10*s.* 6*d.*

*PLAYFAIR (Lieut.-Col.), Her Britannic Majesty's Consul-General in Algiers.*

TRAVELS IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF BRUCE IN ALGERIA AND TUNIS. Illustrated by facsimiles of Bruce's original Drawings, Photographs, Maps, &c. Royal 4to. cloth, bevelled boards, gilt leaves, price £3. 3*s.*

*POOR (H. V.)*—MONEY AND ITS LAWS: embracing a History of Monetary Theories &c. Demy 8vo. price 21*s.*

*POUSHKIN (A. S.)*—RUSSIAN ROMANCE. Translated from the Tales of Belkin, &c. By Mrs. J. Buchan Telfer (*née* Mouravieff). Crown 8vo. price 7*s.* 6*d.*

*POWER (H.)*—OUR INVALIDS: HOW SHALL WE EMPLOY AND AMUSE THEM? Fcp. 8vo. price 2*s.* 6*d.*

*PRESBYTER*—UNFOLDINGS OF CHRISTIAN HOPE. An Essay shewing that the Doctrine contained in the Damnatory Clauses of the Creed commonly called Athanasian is Unscriptural. Small crown 8vo. price 4*s.* 6*d.*

*PRICE (Prof. Bonamy)*—CURRENCY AND BANKING. Crown 8vo. price 6*s.*

CHAPTERS ON PRACTICAL POLITICAL ECONOMY. Being the Substance of Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford. Large post 8vo. price 12*s.*

*PROCTOR (Richard A.) B.A.*—OUR PLACE AMONG INFINITIES. A Series of Essays contrasting our little abode in space and time with the Infinities around us. To which are added Essays on 'Astrology,' and 'The Jewish Sabbath.' Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6*s.*

THE EXPANSE OF HEAVEN. A Series of Essays on the Wonders of the Firmament. With a Frontispiece. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6*s.*



- PROTEUS AND AMADEUS. A Correspondence. Edited by AUBREY DE VERE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- PUNJAB (THE) AND NORTH-WESTERN FRONTIER OF INDIA. By an Old Punjaabee. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- RAM (*James*)—THE PHILOSOPHY OF WAR. Small crown 8vo. price 3s 6d
- RAVENSHAW (*John Henry*) B.C.S.—GAUR : ITS RUINS AND INSCRIPTIONS. Edited by his Widow. With 40 Photographic Illustrations, and 14 facsimiles of Inscriptions. Royal 4to.
- READ (*Carveth*)—ON THE THEORY OF LOGIC : An Essay. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- RIBOT (*Prof. Th.*)—ENGLISH PSYCHOLOGY. Second Edition. A Revised and Corrected Translation from the latest French Edition. Large post 8vo. price 9s.
- HEREDITY : A Psychological Study on its Phenomena, its Laws, its Causes, and its Consequences. Large crown 8vo. price 9s.
- RINK (*Chevalier Dr. Henry*)—GREENLAND : ITS PEOPLE AND ITS PRODUCTS. By the Chevalier Dr. HENRY RINK, President of the Greenland Board of Trade. With sixteen Illustrations, drawn by the Eskimo, and a Map. Edited by Dr. Robert Brown. Crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- RODWELL (*G. F.*) F.R.A.S., F.C.S.—ETNA : A HISTORY OF THE MOUNTAIN AND ITS ERUPTIONS. With Maps and Illustrations. Square 8vo. cloth.
- ROBERTSON (*The late Rev. F. W.*) M.A., of Brighton.—LIFE AND LETTERS OF. Edited by the Rev. Stopford Brooke, M.A., Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen.
- I. Two vols., uniform with the Sermons. With Steel Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
  - II. Library Edition, in Demy 8vo. with Two Steel Portraits. Price 12s.
  - III. A Popular Edition, in 1 vol. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- SERMONS. Four Series. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d. each.
- NOTES ON GENESIS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- EXPOSITORY LECTURES ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS. A New Edition. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.
- LECTURES AND ADDRESSES, with other Literary Remains. A New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- AN ANALYSIS OF MR. TENNYSON'S 'IN MEMORIAM.' (Dedicated by Permission to the Poet-Laureate.) Fcp. 8vo. price 2s.
- THE EDUCATION OF THE HUMAN RACE. Translated from the German of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- The above Works can also be had, bound in half-morocco.
- \* \* A Portrait of the late Rev. F. W. Robertson, mounted for framing, can be had, price 2s. 6d.
- RUTHERFORD (*John*)—THE SECRET HISTORY OF THE FENIAN CONSPIRACY : its Origin, Objects, and Ramifications. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 18s.
- SCOTT (*W. T.*)—ANTIQUITIES OF AN ESSEX PARISH ; or, Pages from the History of Great Dunmow. Crown 8vo. price 5s. ; sewed, 4s.
- SCOTT (*Robert H.*)—WEATHER CHARTS AND STORM WARNINGS. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.



- SENIOR (N. W.)*—ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE. Correspondence and Conversations with Nassau W. Senior, from 1833 to 1859. Edited by M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Large post 8vo. price 21s.
- JOURNALS KEPT IN FRANCE AND ITALY. From 1848 to 1852. With a Sketch of the Revolution of 1848. Edited by his Daughter, M. C. M. Simpson. 2 vols. Post 8vo. price 24s.
- SEYD (Ernest) F.S.S.*—THE FALL IN THE PRICE OF SILVER. Its Causes, its Consequences, and their Possible Avoidance, with Special Reference to India. Demy 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.
- SHAKSPEARE (Charles)*—SAINT PAUL AT ATHENS. Spiritual Christianity in relation to some aspects of Modern Thought. Five Sermons preached at St. Stephen's Church, Westbourne Park. With a Preface by the Rev. Canon FARRAR.
- SHELLEY (Lady)*—SHELLEY MEMORIALS FROM AUTHENTIC SOURCES. With (now first printed) an Essay on Christianity by Percy Bysshe Shelley. With Portrait. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- SHILLITO (Rev. Joseph)*—WOMANHOOD: its Duties, Temptations, and Privileges. A Book for Young Women. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- SHIPLEY (Rev. Orby) M.A.*—CHURCH TRACTS: OR, STUDIES IN MODERN PROBLEMS. By various Writers. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. price 5s. each.
- PRINCIPLES OF THE FAITH IN RELATION TO SIN. Topics for Thought in Times of Retreat. Eleven Addresses delivered during a Retreat of Three Days to Persons living in the World. Demy 8vo.
- SHUTE (Richard) M.A.*—A DISCOURSE ON TRUTH. Large post 8vo. price 9s.
- SMEDLEY (M. B.)*—BOARDING-OUT AND PAUPER SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- SMITH (Edward) M.D., LL.B., F.R.S.*—HEALTH AND DISEASE, as Influenced by the Daily, Seasonal, and other Cyclical Changes in the Human System. A New Edition. Post 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- PRACTICAL DIETARY FOR FAMILIES, SCHOOLS, AND THE LABOURING CLASSES. A New Edition. Post 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- TUBERCULAR CONSUMPTION IN ITS EARLY AND REMEDIABLE STAGES. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- SMITH (Hubert)*—TENT LIFE WITH ENGLISH GIPSIES IN NORWAY. With Five full-page Engravings and Thirty-one smaller Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map of the Country showing Routes. Third Edition. Revised and Corrected. Post 8vo. price 21s.
- SOME TIME IN IRELAND. A Recollection. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- STEPHENS (Archibald John), LL.D.*—THE FOLKESTONE RITUAL CASE. The Substance of the Argument delivered before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on behalf of the Respondents. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 6s.
- STEVENSON (Rev. W. F.)*—HYMNS FOR THE CHURCH AND HOME. Selected and Edited by the Rev. W. Fleming Stevenson.  
The most complete Hymn Book published.  
The Hymn Book consists of Three Parts:—I. For Public Worship.—II. For Family and Private Worship.—III. For Children.
- \* \* \* Published in various forms and prices, the latter ranging from 8d. to 6s. Lists and full particulars will be furnished on application to the Publishers.

*STEVENSON (Robert Louis)*—AN INLAND VOYAGE. With Frontispiece by Walter Crane. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*SULLY (James) M.A.*—SENSATION AND INTUITION. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

PESSIMISM: a History and a Criticism. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

SUPERNATURAL IN NATURE (THE). A Verification by Free Use of Science. Demy 8vo. price 14s.

*SYME (David)*—OUTLINES OF AN INDUSTRIAL SCIENCE. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*TELFER (J. Buchan) F.R.G.S., Commander R.N.*—THE CRIMEA AND TRANS-CAUCASIA. With numerous Illustrations and Maps. Second Edition. 2 vols. Royal 8vo. medium 8vo. price 36s.

*THOMPSON (Rev. A. S.)*—HOME WORDS FOR WANDERERS. A Volume of Sermons. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*THOMSON (J. Turnbull)*—SOCIAL PROBLEMS; OR, AN INQUIRY INTO THE LAWS OF INFLUENCE. With Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth.

*TRAHERNE (Mrs. A.)*—THE ROMANTIC ANNALS OF A NAVAL FAMILY. A New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

*VAMBERY (Prof. A.)*—BOKHARA: Its History and Conquest. Second Edition. Demy 8vo. price 18s.

*VILLARI (Professor)*—NICCOLO MACHIAVELLI AND HIS TIMES. Translated by Linda Villari. 2 vols. Large post 8vo.

*VYNER (Lady Mary)*—EVERY DAY A PORTION. Adapted from the Bible and the Prayer Book, for the Private Devotions of those living in Widowhood. Collected and Edited by Lady Mary Vyner. Square crown 8vo. extra, price 5s.

*WALDSTEIN (Charles) Ph.D.*—THE BALANCE OF EMOTION AND INTELLECT; an Introductory Essay to the Study of Philosophy. Crown 8vo. cloth.

*WALLER (Rev. C. B.)*—THE APOCALYPSE, reviewed under the Light of the Doctrine of the Unfolding Ages, and the Relation of All Things. Demy 8vo. price 12s.

*WELLS (Capt. John C.) R.N.*—SPITZBERGEN—THE GATEWAY TO THE POLYNIA; or, a Voyage to Spitzbergen. With numerous Illustrations by Whymper and others, and Map. New and Cheaper Edition. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

*WETMORE (W. S.)*—COMMERCIAL TELEGRAPHIC CODE. Second Edition. Post 4to. boards, price 42s.

*WHITE (A. D.) LL.D.*—WARFARE OF SCIENCE. With Prefatory Note by Professor Tyndall. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*WHITNEY (Prof. William Dwight)*—ESSENTIALS OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR, for the Use of Schools. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

*WHITTLE (J. L.) A.M.*—CATHOLICISM AND THE VATICAN. With a Narrative of the Old Catholic Congress at Munich. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

*WILBERFORCE (H. W.)*—THE CHURCH AND THE EMPIRES. Historical Periods. Preceded by a Memoir of the Author by John Henry Newman, D.D. of the Oratory. With Portrait. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

- WILKINSON (T. L.)*—SHORT LECTURES ON THE LAND LAWS. Delivered before the Working Men's College. Crown 8vo. limp cloth, price 2s.
- WILLIAMS (A. Lukyn)*—FAMINES IN INDIA ; their Causes and Possible Prevention. The Essay for the Le Bas Prize, 1875. Demy 8vo. price 5s.
- WILLIAMS (Chas.)*—THE ARMENIAN CAMPAIGN. A Diary of the Campaign of 1877 in Armenia and Koordistan. Large post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.
- WILLIAMS (Rowland) D.D.*—LIFE AND LETTERS OF ; with Extracts from his Note-Books. Edited by Mrs. Rowland Williams. With a Photographic Portrait. 2 vols. large post 8vo. price 24s.
- PSALMS, LITANIES, COUNSELS, AND COLLECTS FOR DEVOUT PERSONS. Edited by his Widow. New and Popular Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- STRAY THOUGHTS COLLECTED FROM THE WRITINGS OF THE LATE ROWLAND WILLIAMS, D.D. Edited by his Widow.
- WILLIS (R.) M.D.*—SERVETUS AND CALVIN : a Study of an Important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation. 8vo. price 16s.
- WILLIAM HARVEY. A History of the Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood : with a Portrait of Harvey after Faithorne. Demy 8vo. cloth.
- WILSON (H. Schütz)*—STUDIES AND ROMANCES. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- WILSON (Lieut.-Col. C. T.)*—JAMES THE SECOND AND THE DUKE OF BERWICK. Demy 8vo. price 12s. 6d.
- WINTERBOTHAM (Rev. R.) M.A., B.Sc.*—SERMONS AND EXPOSITIONS. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- WOLLSTONECRAFT (Mary)*—LETTERS TO IMLAY. New Edition with Prefatory Memoir by C. KEGAN PAUL, author of 'William Godwin : His Friends and Contemporaries,' &c. Crown 8vo.
- WOOD (C. F.)*—A YACHTING CRUISE IN THE SOUTH SEAS. With six Photographic Illustrations. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- WRIGHT (Rev. David) M.A.*—WAITING FOR THE LIGHT, AND OTHER SERMONS. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- WYLD (R. S.) F.R.S.E.*—THE PHYSICS AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE SENSES; or, the Mental and the Physical in their Mutual Relation. Illustrated by several Plates. Demy 8vo. price 16s.
- YONGE (C. D.)*—HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION OF 1688. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- YOUMANS (Eliza A.)*—AN ESSAY ON THE CULTURE OF THE OBSERVING POWERS OF CHILDREN, especially in connection with the Study of Botany. Edited, with Notes and a Supplement, by Joseph Payne, F.C.P., Author of 'Lectures on the Science and Art of Education,' &c. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- FIRST BOOK OF BOTANY. Designed to Cultivate the Observing Powers of Children. With 300 Engravings. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- YOUMANS (Edward L.) M.D.*—A CLASS BOOK OF CHEMISTRY, on the Basis of the New System. With 200 Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.



## THE INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC SERIES.

- I. FORMS OF WATER : a Familiar Exposition of the Origin and Phenomena of Glaciers. By J. Tyndall, LL.D., F.R.S. With 25 Illustrations. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- II. PHYSICS AND POLITICS; or, Thoughts on the Application of the Principles of 'Natural Selection' and 'Inheritance' to Political Society. By Walter Bagehot. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s.
- III. FOODS. By Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- IV. MIND AND BODY : the Theories of their Relation. By Alexander Bain, LL.D. With Four Illustrations. Sixth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 4s.
- V. THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. By Herbert Spencer. Seventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- VI. ON THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY. By Balfour Stewart, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S. With 14 Illustrations. Fifth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- VII. ANIMAL LOCOMOTION; or, Walking, Swimming, and Flying. By J. B. Pettigrew, M.D., F.R.S., &c. With 130 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- VIII. RESPONSIBILITY IN MENTAL DISEASE. By Henry Maudsley, M.D. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- IX. THE NEW CHEMISTRY. By Professor J. P. Cooke, of the Harvard University. With 31 Illustrations. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- X. THE SCIENCE OF LAW. By Professor Sheldon Amos. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XI. ANIMAL MECHANISM: a Treatise on Terrestrial and Aerial Locomotion. By Professor E. J. Marey. With 117 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XII. THE DOCTRINE OF DESCENT AND DARWINISM. By Professor Oscar Schmidt (Strasburg University). With 26 Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XIII. THE HISTORY OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE. By J. W. Draper, M.D., LL.D. Eleventh Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XIV. FUNGI: their Nature, Influences, Uses, &c. By M. C. Cooke, M.D., LL.D. Edited by the Rev. M. J. Berkeley, M.A., F.L.S. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XV. THE CHEMICAL EFFECTS OF LIGHT AND PHOTOGRAPHY. By Dr. Hermann Vogel (Polytechnic Academy of Berlin). Translation thoroughly revised. With 100 Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XVI. THE LIFE AND GROWTH OF LANGUAGE. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanscrit and Comparative Philology in Yale College, Newhaven. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XVII. MONEY AND THE MECHANISM OF EXCHANGE. By W. Stanley Jevons, M.A., F.R.S. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XVIII. THE NATURE OF LIGHT. With a General Account of Physical Optics. By Dr. Eugene Lommel, Professor of Physics in the University of Erlangen. With 188 Illustrations and a Table of Spectra in Chromo-lithography. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XIX. ANIMAL PARASITES AND MESSMATES. By Monsieur Van Beneden, Professor of the University of Louvain, Correspondent of the Institute of France. With 83 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XX. FERMENTATION. By Professor Schützenberger, Director of the Chemical Laboratory at the Sorbonne. With 28 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.



- XXI. THE FIVE SENSES OF MAN. By Professor Bernstein, of the University of Halle. With 91 Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XXII. THE THEORY OF SOUND IN ITS RELATION TO MUSIC. By Professor Pietro Blaserna, of the Royal University of Rome. With numerous Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- XXIII. STUDIES IN SPECTRUM ANALYSIS. By J. Norman Lockyer, F.R.S. With six photographic Illustrations of Spectra, and numerous engravings on Wood. Crown 8vo. Second Edition. Price 6s. 6d.
- Forthcoming Volumes.*
- Prof. W. KINGDON CLIFFORD, M.A. The First Principles of the Exact Sciences explained to the Non-mathematical.
- W. B. CARPENTER, LL.D., F.R.S. The Physical Geography of the Sea.
- Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, Bart., F.R.S. On Ants and Bees.
- Prof. W. T. THISELTON DYER, B.A., B.Sc. Form and Habit in Flowering Plants.
- Prof. MICHAEL FOSTER, M.D. Protoplasm and the Cell Theory.
- H. CHARLTON BASTIAN, M.D., F.R.S. The Brain as an Organ of Mind.
- P. BERT (Professor of Physiology, Paris). Forms of Life and other Cosmical Conditions.
- Prof. A. C. RAMSAY, LL.D., F.R.S. Earth Sculpture: Hills, Valleys, Mountains, Plains, Rivers, Lakes; how they were Produced, and how they have been Destroyed.
- Prof. T. H. HUXLEY. The Crayfish: an Introduction to the Study of Zoology.
- The Rev. A. SECCHI, D.J., late Director of the Observatory at Rome. The Stars.
- Prof. J. ROSENTHAL, of the University of Erlangen. General Physiology of Muscles and Nerves.
- Prof. A. DE QUATREFAGES, Membre de l'Institut. The Human Race.
- Prof. THURSTON. The Steam Engine. With numerous Engravings.
- FRANCIS GALTON, F.R.S. Psychometry.
- J. W. JUDD, F.R.S. The Laws of Volcanic Action.
- Prof. F. N. BALFOUR. The Embryonic Phases of Animal Life.
- J. LUYS, Physician to the Hospice de la Salpêtrière. The Brain and its Functions. With Illustrations.
- Dr. CARL SEMPER. Animals and their Conditions of Existence.
- Prof. WURTZ. Atoms and the Atomic Theory.
- GEORGE J. ROMANES, F.L.S. Animal Intelligence.
- ALFRED W. BENNETT. A Handbook of Cryptogamic Botany.

## MILITARY WORKS.

- ANDERSON (*Col. R. P.*)—VICTORIES AND DEFEATS: an Attempt to explain the Causes which have led to them. An Officer's Manual. Demy 8vo. price 14s.
- ARMY OF THE NORTH GERMAN CONFEDERATION: a Brief Description of its Organisation, of the Different Branches of the Service and their rôle in War, of its Mode of Fighting, &c. Translated from the Corrected Edition, by permission of the Author, by Colonel Edward Newdigate. Demy 8vo. price 5s.
- BLUME (*Maj. W.*)—THE OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ARMIES IN FRANCE, from Sedan to the end of the War of 1870-71. With Map. From the Journals of the Head-quarters Staff. Translated by the late E. M. Jones, Maj. 20th Foot, Prof. of Mil. Hist., Sandhurst. Demy 8vo. price 9s.
- BOGUSLAWSKI (*Capt. A. von*)—TACTICAL DEDUCTIONS FROM THE WAR OF 1870-1. Translated by Colonel Sir Lumley Graham, Bart., late 18th (Royal Irish) Regiment. Third Edition, Revised and Corrected. Demy 8vo. price 7s.

**BRACKENBURY** (*Lieut.-Col.*) *C.B., R.A., A.A.G.* MILITARY HANDBOOKS FOR REGIMENTAL OFFICERS. I. Military Sketching and Reconnaissance, by Lieut.-Col. F. J. Hutchison, and Capt. H. G. MacGregor. With 15 Plates. Small 8vo. cloth, price 6s. II. The Elements of Modern Tactics, by Major Wilkinson Shaw. With numerous Plates.

**BRIALMONT** (*Col. A.*)—HASTY INTRENCHMENTS. Translated by Lieut. Charles A. Empson, *R.A.* With Nine Plates. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

**CLERY** (*C.*) *Capt.*—MINOR TACTICS. With 26 Maps and Plans. Third and revised Edition. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 16s.

**DU VERNOIS** (*Col. von Verdy*)—STUDIES IN LEADING TROOPS. An authorised and accurate Translation by Lieutenant H. J. T. Hildyard, 71st Foot. Parts I. and II. Demy 8vo. price 7s.

**GOETZE** (*Capt. A. von*)—OPERATIONS OF THE GERMAN ENGINEERS DURING THE WAR OF 1870-1. Published by Authority, and in accordance with Official Documents. Translated from the German by Colonel G. Graham, *V.C., C.B., R.E.* With 6 large Maps. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

**HARRISON** (*Lieut.-Col. R.*) — THE OFFICER'S MEMORANDUM BOOK FOR PEACE AND WAR. Second Edition. Oblong 32mo. roan, elastic band and pencil, price 3s. 6d.; *russia*, 5s.

**HELVIG** (*Capt. H.*)—THE OPERATIONS OF THE BAVARIAN ARMY CORPS. Translated by Captain G. S. Schwabe. With Five large Maps. In 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 24s.

TACTICAL EXAMPLES: Vol. I. The Battalion, price 15s. Vol. II. The Regiment and Brigade, price 10s. 6d. Translated from the German by Col. Sir Lumley Graham. With nearly 300 Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth.

**HOFFBAUER** (*Capt.*)—THE GERMAN ARTILLERY IN THE BATTLES NEAR METZ. Based on the Official Reports of the German Artillery. Translated by Captain E. O. Hollist. With Map and Plans. Demy 8vo. price 21s.

**LAYMANN** (*Capt.*)—THE FRONTAL ATTACK OF INFANTRY. Translated by Colonel Edward Newdigate. Crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

NOTES ON CAVALRY TACTICS, ORGANISATION, &c. By a Cavalry Officer. With Diagrams. Demy 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

**PAGE** (*Capt. S. F.*)—DISCIPLINE AND DRILL. Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 1s.

PUBLIC SCHOOLBOY: the Volunteer, the Militiaman, and the Regular Soldier. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

**RUSSELL** (*Major Frank S.*)—RUSSIAN WARS WITH TURKEY, PAST AND PRESENT. With Maps. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

**SCHELL** (*Maj. von*)—THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON GOEBEN. Translated by Col. C. H. von Wright. Four Maps. demy 8vo. price 9s.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON STEINMETZ. Translated by Captain E. O. Hollist. Demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

**SCHELLENDORF** (*Major-Gen. B. von*) THE DUTIES OF THE GENERAL STAFF. Translated from the German by Lieutenant Hare. Vol. I. Demy 8vo. cloth, 10s. 6d.

**SCHERFF** (*Maj. W. von*)—STUDIES IN THE NEW INFANTRY TACTICS. Parts I. and II. Translated from the German by Colonel Lumley Graham. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

**SHADWELL** (*Maj.-Gen.*) *C.B.*—MOUNTAIN WARFARE. Illustrated by the Campaign of 1799 in Switzerland. Being a Translation of the Swiss Narrative compiled from the Works of the Archduke Charles, Jomini, and others. Also of Notes by General H. Dufour on the Campaign of the Valtelline in 1635. With Appendix, Maps, and Introductory Remarks. Demy 8vo. price 16s.

**SHERMAN** (*Gen. W. T.*)—MEMOIRS OF GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN, Commander of the Federal Forces in the American Civil War. By Himself. 2 vols. With Map. Demy 8vo. price 24s. *Copyright English Edition.*

**STUBBS** (*Lieut.-Col. F. W.*) — THE REGIMENT OF BENGAL ARTILLERY. The History of its Organisation, Equipment, and War Services. Compiled from Published Works, Official Records, and various Private Sources. With numerous Maps and Illustrations. 2 vols. demy 8vo. price 32s.

**STUMM** (*Lieut. Hugo*), *German Military Attaché to the Khivan Expedition.* — RUSSIA'S ADVANCE EASTWARD. Based on the Official Reports of. Translated by Capt. C. E. H. VINCENT, With Map. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

**VINCENT** (*Capt. C. E. H.*) — ELEMENTARY MILITARY GEOGRAPHY, RECONNOITRING, AND SKETCHING. Compiled for Non-commissioned Officers and Soldiers of all Arms. Square crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

**WHITE** (*Capt. F. B. P.*) — THE SUBSTANTIVE SENIORITY ARMY LIST — MAJORS AND CAPTAINS. 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

**WARTENSLEBEN** (*Count H. von.*) — THE OPERATIONS OF THE SOUTH ARMY IN JANUARY AND FEBRUARY, 1871. Compiled from the Official War Documents of the Headquarters of the Southern Army. Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. With Maps. Demy 8vo. price 6s.

THE OPERATIONS OF THE FIRST ARMY UNDER GEN. VON MANTEUFFEL. Translated by Colonel C. H. von Wright. Uniform with the above. Demy 8vo. price 9s.

**WICKHAM** (*Capt. E. H., R.A.*) — INFLUENCE OF FIREARMS UPON TACTICS: Historical and Critical Investigations. By an OFFICER OF SUPERIOR RANK (in the German Army). Translated by Captain E. H. Wickham, R.A. Demy 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

**WOINOVITS** (*Capt. I.*) — AUSTRIAN CAVALRY EXERCISE. Translated by Captain W. S. Cooke. Crown 8vo. price 7s.

## POETRY.

**ABBEY** (*Henry*) — BALLADS OF GOOD DEEDS, and other Verses. Fcp. 8vo. cloth gilt, price 5s.

**ADAMS** (*W. D.*) — LYRICS OF LOVE, from Shakespeare to Tennyson. Selected and arranged by. Fcp. 8vo. cloth extra, gilt edges, price 3s. 6d.

Also, a Cheaper Edition. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

**ADAMS** (*John*) *M.A.* — ST. MALO'S QUEST, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**ADON** — THROUGH STORM AND SUNSHINE. Illustrated by M. E. Edwards, A. T. H. Paterson, and the Author. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

**A. J. R.** — TOLD IN TWILIGHT; Stories in Verse, Songs, &c. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**AUBERTIN** (*J. J.*) — CAMOENS' LUSIADS. Portuguese Text, with Translation by. Map and Portraits. 2 vols. Demy 8vo. price 30s.

**AURORA**: a Volume of Verse. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s

**BARING** (*T. C.*) *M.A., M.P.* — PINDAR IN ENGLISH RHYME. Being an Attempt to render the Epinikian Odes with the principal remaining Fragments of Pindar into English Rhymed Verse. Small 4to. price 7s.

**BAYNES** (*Rev. Canon R. H.*) *M.A.* — HOME SONGS FOR QUIET HOURS. Fourth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.  
This may also be had handsomely bound in morocco with gilt edges.

**BENNETT** (*Dr. W. C.*) — NARRATIVE POEMS AND BALLADS. Fcp. 8vo. sewed, in Coloured Wrapper, price 1s.  
SONGS FOR SAILORS. Dedicated by Special Request to H.R.H. the Duke of Edinburgh. With Steel Portrait and Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

An Edition in Illustrated Paper Covers, price 1s.

SONGS OF A SONG WRITER. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

**BOSWELL** (*R. B.*) *M.A. Oxon.* — METRICAL TRANSLATIONS FROM THE GREEK AND LATIN POETS, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 5s.



**BRYANT (W. C.)**—POEMS. Red-line Edition. With 24 Illustrations and Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo. cloth extra, price 7s. 6d.

A Cheap Edition, with Frontispiece. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**BUCHANAN (Robt.)**—POETICAL WORKS. Collected Edition, in 3 vols. with Portrait. Crown 8vo. price 6s. each.

MASTER-SPIRITS. Post 8vo. price 10s. 6d.

**BULKELEY (Rev. H. J.)**—WALLED IN, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

**CALDERON'S DRAMAS**: the Wonder-Working Magician—Life is a Dream—the Purgatory of St. Patrick. Translated by Denis Florence MacCarthy. Post 8vo. price 10s.

**CARPENTER (E.)**—NARCISSUS, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**COLLINS (Mortimer)**—INN OF STRANGE MEETINGS, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

**CORY (Lieut.-Col. Arthur)**—IONE: a Poem in Four Parts. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

**COSMOS**: a Poem. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**CRESSWELL (Mrs. G.)**—THE KING'S BANNER: Drama in Four Acts. Five Illustrations. 4to. price 10s. 6d.

**DENNIS (J.)**—ENGLISH SONNETS. Collected and Arranged. Elegantly bound. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**DE VERE (Aubrey)**—ALEXANDER THE GREAT: a Dramatic Poem. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

THE INFANT BRIDAL, and other Poems. A New and Enlarged Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THE LEGENDS OF ST. PATRICK, and other Poems. Small crown 8vo. price 5s.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY: a Dramatic Poem. Large fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

ANTAR AND ZARA: an Eastern Romance. INISFAIL, and other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

THE FALL OF RORA, THE SEARCH AFTER PROSERPINE, and other Poems, Meditative and Lyrical. Fcp. 8vo. 6s.

**DOBSON (Austin)**—VIGNETTES IN RHYME, and Vers de Société. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

PROVERBS IN PORCELAIN. By the Author of 'Vignettes in Rhyme.' Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

**DOWDEN (Edward) LL.D.**—POEMS. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**DOWNTON (Rev. H.) M.A.**—HYMNS AND VERSES. Original and Translated. Small crown 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

**DURAND (Lady)**—IMITATIONS FROM THE GERMAN OF SPITTA AND TERSTEGEN. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s.

**EDWARDS (Rev. Basil)**—MINOR CHORDS; or, Songs for the Suffering: a Volume of Verse. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.; paper, price, 2s. 6d.

**ELLIOT (Lady Charlotte)**—MEDUSA and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

**ELLIOTT (Ebenezer), The Corn Law Rhymers.**—POEMS. Edited by his son, the Rev. Edwin Elliott, of St. John's, Antigua. 2 vols. crown 8vo. price 18s.

EPIC OF HADES (THE). By the Author of 'Songs of Two Worlds.' Fifth and finally revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

EROS AGONISTES: Poems. By E. B. D. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**EYRE (Maj.-Gen. Sir V.) C.B., K.C.S.I., &c.**—LAYS OF A KNIGHT-ERRANT IN MANY LANDS. Square crown 8vo. with Six Illustrations, price 7s. 6d.

**FERRIS (Henry Weybridge)**—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**GARDNER (H.)**—SUNFLOWERS: a Book of Verses. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**G. H. T.**—VERSES, mostly written in India. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

**GOLDIE (Lieut. M. H. G.)**—HEBE: a Tale. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

**HARCOURT (Capt. A. F. P.)**—THE SHAKESPEARE ARGOSY. Containing much of the wealth of Shakespeare's Wisdom and Wit, alphabetically arranged and classified. Crown 8vo. price 6s.



- HEWLETT (Henry G.)**—A SHEAF OF VERSE. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- HOLMES (E. G. A.)**—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- HOWARD (Rev. G. B.)**—AN OLD LEGEND OF ST. PAUL'S. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.
- HOWELL (James)**—A TALE OF THE SEA, Sonnets, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- HUGHES (Allison)**—PENELOPE, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.
- INCHBOLD (J. W.)**—ANNUS AMORIS: Sonnets. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.
- KING (Mrs. Hamilton)**—THE DISCIPLES: a New Poem. Third Edition, with some Notes. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- ASPRMONTE, and other Poems. Second Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.
- KNIGHT (A. F. C.)**—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- LADY OF LIPARI (THE)**: a Poem in Three Cantos. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- LOCKER (F.)**—LONDON LYRICS. A New and Revised Edition, with Additions and a Portrait of the Author. Crown 8vo. cloth elegant, price 6s.
- Also, an Edition for the People. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- LUCAS (Alice)**—TRANSLATIONS FROM THE WORKS OF GERMAN POETS OF THE 18TH AND 19TH CENTURIES. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- MAGNUSSON (Eiriker) M.A., and PALMER (E. H.) M.A.**—JOHAN LUDVIG RNEBERG'S LYRICAL SONGS, IDYLLS, AND EPIGRAMS. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
- MIDDLETON (The Lady)**—BALLADS. Square 16mo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.
- MILLER (Robert)**—THE ROMANCE OF LOVE. Fcp. cloth, price 5s.
- MORICE (Rev. F. D.) M.A.**—THE OLYMPIAN AND PYTHIAN ODES OF PINDAR. A New Translation in English Verse. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- MORSHEAD (E. D. A.)**—THE AGAMEMNON OF ÆSCHYLUS. Translated into English Verse. With an Introductory Essay. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
- NEW WRITER (A)**—SONGS OF TWO WORLDS. Third Edition. Complete in One Volume. With Portrait. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- THE EPIC OF HADES. By the Author of 'Songs of Two Worlds.' Fourth and finally revised Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 7s. 6d.
- NICHOLSON (Edward B.)** *Librarian of the London Institution*—THE CHRIST CHILD, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.
- NOAKE (Major R. Compton)**—THE BIVOUAC; or, Martial Lyrist. With an Appendix: Advice to the Soldier. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s. 6d.
- NORRIS (Rev. Alfred)**—THE INNER AND OUTER LIFE POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 6s.
- PAUL (C. Kegan)**—GOETHE'S FAUST. A New Translation in Rhyme. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- PAYNE (John)**—SONGS OF LIFE AND DEATH. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
- PEACOCKE (Georgiana)**—RAYS FROM THE SOUTHERN CROSS: Poems. Crown 8vo. with Sixteen Full-page Illustrations by the Rev. P. Walsh. Crown 8vo. cloth elegant, price 10s. 6d.
- PENNELL (H. Cholmondeley)**—PEGASUS RESADDLED. By the Author of 'Puck on Pegasus,' &c. &c. With Ten Full-page Illustrations by George Du Maurier. Second Edition. Fcp. 4to. cloth elegant, 12s. 6d.
- PFEIFFER (Emily)**—GLAN ALARCH: His Silence and Song: a Poem. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- GERARD'S MONUMENT and other Poems. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.
- POEMS. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.
- POWLETT (Lieut. N.) R.A.**—EASTERN LEGENDS AND STORIES IN ENGLISH VERSE. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- RHOADES (James)**—TIMOLEON: a Dramatic Poem. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.
- ROBINSON (A. Mary F.)**—A HANDFUL OF HONEYSUCKLE. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

*SCOTT (Patrick)*—THE DREAM AND THE DEED, and other Poems. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

SONGS OF TWO WORLDS. By the Author of 'The Epic of Hades.' Fourth Edition. Complete in one Volume, with Portrait. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 7s. 6d.

SONGS FOR MUSIC. By Four Friends. Containing Songs by Reginald A. Gatty, Stephen H. Gatty, Greville J. Chester, and Juliana Ewing. Square crown 8vo. price 5s.

*SPICER (H.)*—OTHO'S DEATH WAGER : a Dark Page of History Illustrated. In Five Acts. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

*STAPLETON (John)*—THE THAMES : a Poem. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*STONEHEWER (Agnes)*—MONACELLA : a Legend of North Wales. A Poem. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.

SWEET SILVERLY SAYINGS OF SHAKESPEARE. Crown 8vo. cloth gilt, price 7s. 6d.

*TAYLOR (Rev. J. W. A.) M.A.*—POEMS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

*TAYLOR (Sir H.)*—Works Complete in Five Volumes. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 30s.

*TENNYSON (Alfred)*—Works Complete:—

THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY EDITION. Complete in 7 vols. demy 8vo. price 10s. 6d. each; in Roxburgh binding, 12s. 6d. (*See p. 32.*)

AUTHOR'S EDITION. In Six Volumes. Post 8vo. cloth gilt; or half-morocco. Roxburgh style. (*See p. 32.*)

CABINET EDITION. 12 Volumes. Each with Frontispiece. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. each. (*See p. 32.*)

CABINET EDITION. 12 vols. Complete in handsome Ornamental Case. (*See p. 32.*)

POCKET VOLUME EDITION. 13 vols. in neat case, price 36s. Ditto, ditto. Extra cloth gilt, in case, price 42s. (*See p. 32.*)

THE GUINEA EDITION OF THE POETICAL AND DRAMATIC WORKS, complete in 12 vols. neatly bound and enclosed in box. Cloth, price 21s.; French morocco, price 31s. 6d.

*TENNYSON (Alfred)*—cont.

SHILLING EDITION OF THE POETICAL WORKS. In 12 vols. pocket size, 1s. each, sewed.

THE CROWN EDITION. Complete in 1 vol. strongly bound in cloth, price 6s.; cloth, extra gilt leaves, price 7s. 6d.; Roxburgh, half-morocco, price 7s. 6d.

\* \* Can also be had in a variety of other bindings.

Original Editions:—

POEMS. Small 8vo. price 6s.

MAUD, and other Poems. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

THE PRINCESS. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

IDYLLS OF THE KING. Small 8vo. price 5s.

IDYLLS OF THE KING. Complete. Small 8vo. price 6s.

THE HOLY GRAIL, and other Poems. Small 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

GARETH AND LYNETTE. Small 8vo. price 3s.

ENOCH ARDEN, &c. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

IN MEMORIAM. Small 8vo. price 4s.

HAROLD : a Drama. New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

QUEEN MARY : a Drama. New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

SELECTIONS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. Super royal 16mo. price 3s. 6d.; cloth gilt extra, price 4s.

SONGS FROM THE ABOVE WORKS. 16mo. cloth, price 2s. 6d.; cloth extra, 3s. 6d.

TENNYSON'S IDYLLS OF THE KING, and other Poems. Illustrated by Julia Margaret Cameron. 2 vols. folio. half-bound morocco, cloth sides, price £6. 6s. each.

TENNYSON FOR THE YOUNG AND FOR RECITATION. Specially arranged. Fcp. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

THE TENNYSON BIRTHDAY BOOK. Edited by Emily Shakespear. 32mo. cloth limp, 2s.; cloth extra, 3s.

*THOMPSON (Alice C.)*—PRELUDES : a Volume of Poems. Illustrated by Elizabeth Thompson (Painter of 'The Roll Call'). 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

THOUGHTS IN VERSE. Small crown 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

*THRING (Rev. Godfrey), B.As*—HYMNS AND SACRED LYRICS. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

*TODD (Herbert) M.A.*—ARVAN ; or, the Story of the Sword. A Poem. Crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

*TODHUNTER (Dr. J.)*—LAURELLA, and other Poems. Crown 8vo. price 6s. 6d.

*TURNER (Rev. C. Tennyson)*—SONNETS, LYRICS, AND TRANSLATIONS. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.

*WATERFIELD (W.)*—HYMNS FOR HOLY DAYS AND SEASONS. 32mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

*WAY (A.) M.A.*—THE ODES OF HORACE LITERALLY TRANSLATED IN METRE. Fcp. 8vo. price 2s.

*WILLOUGHBY (The Hon. Mrs.)*—ON THE NORTH WIND—THISTLEDOWN : a Volume of Poems. Elegantly bound, small crown 8vo. price 7s. 6d.

## LIBRARY NOVELS.

BLUE ROSES ; or, Helen Malinofska's Marriage. By the Author of 'Vera.' Fifth Edition. 2 vols. cloth, gilt tops, 12s.

*CHAPMAN (Hon. Mrs. E. W.)*—A CONSTANT HEART : a Story. 2 vols. cloth, gilt tops, 12s.

*HOCKLEY (W. B.)*—TALES OF THE ZENANA ; or, a Nuwab's Leisure Hours. By the Author of 'Pandurang Hari.' With a Preface by Lord Stanley of Alderley. 2 vols. crown 8vo. cloth, price 21s.

*MASTERMAN (J.)*—WORTH WAITING FOR : a New Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo. cloth.

*MORLEY (Susan)*—MARGARET CHETWYND : a Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

*PAUL (Margaret Agnes)*—GENTLE AND SIMPLE : a Story. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

*SHAW (Flora L.)*—CASTLE BLAIR : a Story of Youthful Lives. 2 vols. crown 8vo. cloth, price 12s.

*STRETTON (Miss Hesba)*—THROUGH A NEEDLE'S EYE. 2 vols. crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

*TAYLOR (Colonel Meadows) C.S.I., M.R.I.A.*—SEETA : a Novel. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

A NOBLE QUEEN. 3 vols. crown 8vo.

WITHIN SOUND OF THE SEA. By the Author of 'Vera,' &c. &c. 2 vols. Crown 8vo. gilt tops, price 12s.

## WORKS OF FICTION IN ONE VOLUME.

*BETHAM-EDWARDS (Miss M.)*—KITTY. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

BLUE ROSES ; or, Helen Malinofska's Marriage. By the Author of 'Vera.' New and Cheaper Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

*CLERK (Mrs. Godfrey)*—'ILÂM EN NÂS : Historical Tales and Anecdotes of the Times of the Early Khalifahs. Translated from the Arabic Originals. Illustrated with Historical and Explanatory Notes. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 7s.

*GARRETT (E.)*—BY STILL WATERS : a Story for Quiet Hours. With Seven Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*HARDY (Thomas)*—A PAIR OF BLUE EYES. Author of 'Far from the Madding Crowd.' New Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*HOWARD (Mary M.)*—BEATRICE AYLMER, and other Tales. Crown 8vo. price 6s.



*IGNOTUS*—CULMSHIRE FOLK: a Novel. New and Cheaper Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*MACDONALD (G.)*—MALCOLM. With Portrait of the Author engraved on Steel. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

THE MARQUIS OF LOSSIE. Second Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

ST. GEORGE AND ST. MICHAEL. Second Edition. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. cloth, 6s.

*MEREDITH (George)* — ORDEAL OF RICHARD FEVEREL. New Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

*PALGRAVE (W. Gifford)*—HERMANN AGHA: an Eastern Narrative. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

PANDURANG HARI; or, Memoirs of a Hindoo. With an Introductory Preface by Sir H. Bartle E. Frere, G.C.S.I., C.B. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*PAUL (Margaret Agnes)*—GENTLE AND SIMPLE: A Story. New and Cheaper Edition, with Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*SAUNDERS (John)*—ISRAEL MORT, OVERMAN: a Story of the Mine. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*SAUNDERS (Katherine)* — GIDEON'S ROCK, and other Stories. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*SAUNDERS (Katherine)*—cont.

JOAN MERRYWEATHER, and other Stories. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

MARGARET AND ELIZABETH: a Story of the Sea. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*SHAW (Flora L.)*—CASTLE BLAIR; a Story of Youthful Lives. New and Cheaper Edition, with Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*TAYLOR (Col. Meadows) C.S.I., M.R.I.A.* THE CONFESSIONS OF A THUG. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

TARA: a Mahratta Tale. Crown 8vo. price 6s.

*CORNHILL LIBRARY of FICTION (The)*. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d. per volume.

HALF-A-DOZEN DAUGHTERS. By J. Masterman.

THE HOUSE OF RABY. By Mrs. G. Hooper.

A FIGHT FOR LIFE. By Moy Thomas.

ROBIN GRAY. By Charles Gibbon.

ONE OF TWO; or, The Left-Handed Bride. By J. Hain Friswell.

GOD'S PROVIDENCE HOUSE. By Mrs. G. L. Banks. New Edition.

FOR LACK OF GOLD. By Charles Gibbon.

ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE. By John Saunders.

HIRELL. By John Saunders.

#### CHEAP FICTION.

*GIBBON (Charles)*—FOR LACK OF GOLD. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated Boards, price 2s.

ROBIN GRAY. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

*SAUNDERS (John)*—HIRELL. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

ABEL DRAKE'S WIFE. With Frontispiece. Illustrated boards, price 2s.

#### BOOKS FOR THE YOUNG.

AUNT MARY'S BRAN PIE. By the Author of 'St. Olave's.' Illustrated. Price 3s. 6d.

*BARLEE (Ellen)*—LOCKED OUT: a Tale of the Strike. With a Frontispiece. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

*BONWICK (F.) F.R.G.S.*—THE TASMANNIAN LILY. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

MIKE HOWE, the Bushranger of Van Diemen's Land. With Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.



- BRAVE MEN'S FOOTSTEPS.** By the Editor of 'Men who have Risen.' A Book of Example and Anecdote for Young People. With Four Illustrations by C. Doyle. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- CHILDREN'S TOYS,** and some Elementary Lessons in General Knowledge which they teach. Illustrated. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
- COLERIDGE (Sara)**—PRETTY LESSONS IN VERSE FOR GOOD CHILDREN, with some Lessons in Latin, in Easy Rhyme. A New Edition. Illustrated. Fcp. 8vo. cloth, price 3s. 6d.
- D'ANVERS (N. R.)**—LITTLE MINNIE'S TROUBLES: an Every-day Chronicle. With 4 Illustrations by W. H. Hughes. Fcp. cloth, price 3s. 6d.
- PIXIE'S ADVENTURES;** or, the Tale of a Terrier. With 21 Illustrations. 16mo. cloth, price 4s. 6d.
- NANNY.** With numerous Illustrations. Square 16mo. cloth.
- DAVIES (G. Christopher)**—MOUNTAIN, MEADOW, AND MERE: a Series of Outdoor Sketches of Sport, Scenery, Adventures, and Natural History. With Sixteen Illustrations by Bosworth W. Harcourt. Crown 8vo. price 6s.
- RAMBLES AND ADVENTURES OF OUR SCHOOL FIELD CLUB.** With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- DRUMMOND (Miss)**—TRIPP'S BUILDINGS. A Study from Life, with Frontispiece. Small crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- EDMONDS (Herbert)**—WELL SPENT LIVES: a Series of Modern Biographies. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- EVANS (Mark)**—THE STORY OF OUR FATHER'S LOVE, told to Children; being a New and Enlarged Edition of Theology for Children. With Four Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- FARQUHARSON (M.)**
- I. **ELSIE DINSMORE.** Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
  - II. **ELSIE'S GIRLHOOD.** Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
  - III. **ELSIE'S HOLIDAYS AT ROSELANDS.** Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- HERFORD (Brooke)**—THE STORY OF RELIGION IN ENGLAND: a Book for Young Folk. Cr. 8vo. cloth, price 5s.
- INGELOW (Jean)**—THE LITTLE WONDER-HORN. With Fifteen Illustrations. Small 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- KER (David)**—THE BOY SLAVE IN BOKHARA: a Tale of Central Asia. With Illustrations. Cr. 8vo. price 5s.
- THE WILD HORSEMAN OF THE PAMPAS.** Illustrated. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- LEANDER (Richard)**—FANTASTIC STORIES. Translated from the German by Paulina B. Granville. With Eight Full-page Illustrations by M. E. Fraser-Tytler. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- LEE (Holme)**—HER TITLE OF HONOUR. A Book for Girls. New Edition. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- LEWIS (Mary A.)**—A RAT WITH THREE TALES. With Four Illustrations by Catherine F. Frere. Price 5s.
- LITTLE MINNIE'S TROUBLES:** an Every-day Chronicle. With Four Illustrations by W. H. Hughes. Fcap. price 3s. 6d.
- MC CLINTOCK (L.)**—SIR SPANGLE AND THE DINGY HEN. Illustrated. Square crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- MAC KENNA (S. J.)**—PLUCKY FELLOWS. A Book for Boys. With Six Illustrations. Fourth Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.
- AT SCHOOL WITH AN OLD DRAGOON.** With Six Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.
- MALDEN (H. E.)**—PRINCES AND PRINCESSES: Two Fairy Tales. Illustrated. Small crown 8vo. price 2s. 6d.
- MASTER BOBBY.** By the Author of "Christina North." With Six Illustrations. Fcp. 8vo. cloth.

**NAAKE (J. T.)**—SLAVONIC FAIRY TALES. From Russian, Servian, Polish, and Bohemian Sources. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

**PELLETAN (E.)**—THE DESERT PASTOR. JEAN JAROUSSEAU. Translated from the French. By Colonel E. P. De L'Hoste. With a Frontispiece. New Edition. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**REANEY (Mrs. G. S.)**—WAKING AND WORKING; or, From Girlhood to Womanhood. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

BLESSING AND BLESSED: a Story of Girl Life. Crown 8vo. cloth, price 5s.

ENGLISH GIRLS: Their Place and Power. With Preface by the Rev. R. W. Dale.

SUNBEAM WILLIE, and other Stories. Three Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

SUNSHINE JENNY and other Stories. 3 Illustrations. Royal 16mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

**ROSS (Mrs. E.)**, ('Nelsie Brook')—DADDY'S PET. A Sketch from Humble Life. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s.

**SADLER (S. W.) R.N.**—THE AFRICAN CRUISER: a Midshipman's Adventures on the West Coast. With Three Illustrations. Second Edition. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SEEKING HIS FORTUNE, and other Stories. With Four Illustrations. Crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

SEVEN AUTUMN LEAVES FROM FAIRY LAND. Illustrated with Nine Etchings. Square crown 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**STORR (Francis) and TURNER (Hawes)**.—CANTERBURY CHIMES; or, Chaucer Tales retold to Children. With Six Illustrations from the Ellesmere MS. Fcap. 8vo. cloth.

**STRETTON (Hesba)**, Author of 'Jessica's First Prayer.'

MICHEL LORIO'S CROSS and other Stories. With Two Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

THE STORM OF LIFE. With Ten Illustrations. Twenty-first Thousand. Roy. 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

**STRETTON (Hesba)**—cont.

THE CREW OF THE DOLPHIN. Illustrated. Fourteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

CASSY. Thirty-eighth Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

THE KING'S SERVANTS. Forty-third Thousand. With Eight Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

LOST GIP. Fifty-ninth Thousand. With Six Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

\*\*\* Also a handsomely bound Edition, with Twelve Illustrations, price 2s. 6d.

**STRETTON (Hesba)**—cont.

DAVID LLOYD'S LAST WILL. With Four Illustrations. Royal 16mo. price 2s. 6d.

THE WONDERFUL LIFE. Thirteenth Thousand. Fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

A NIGHT AND A DAY. With Frontispiece. Twelfth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

FRIENDS TILL DEATH. With Illustrations and Frontispiece. Twenty-fourth Thousand. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.; limp cloth, price 6d.

TWO CHRISTMAS STORIES. With Frontispiece. Twenty-first Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

MICHEL LORIO'S CROSS, AND LEFT ALONE. With Frontispiece. Fifteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

OLD TRANSOME. With Frontispiece. Sixteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

\*\*\* Taken from 'The King's Servants.'

THE WORTH OF A BABY, and How Apple-Tree Court was Won. With Frontispiece. Nineteenth Thousand. Royal 16mo. limp cloth, price 6d.

SUNNYLAND STORIES. By the Author of 'Aunt Mary's Bran Pie.' Illustrated. Small 8vo. price 3s. 6d.

**WHITAKER (Florence)**—CHRISTY'S INHERITANCE. A London Story. Illustrated. Royal 16mo. price 1s. 6d.

**ZIMMERN (H.)**—STORIES IN PRECIOUS STONES. With Six Illustrations. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. price 5s.

# CONTENTS OF THE VARIOUS VOLUMES

IN THE COLLECTED EDITIONS OF

## MR. TENNYSON'S WORKS.

### THE IMPERIAL LIBRARY EDITION,

COMPLETE IN SEVEN OCTAVO VOLUMES.

Cloth, price 10s. 6d. per vol.; 12s. 6d. Roxburgh binding.

#### CONTENTS.

- Vol. I.—MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.  
II.—MISCELLANEOUS POEMS.  
III.—PRINCESS, AND OTHER  
POEMS.

- Vol. IV.—IN MEMORIAM and MAUD.  
V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.  
VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.  
VII.—DRAMAS.

Printed in large, clear, old-faced type, with a Steel Engraved Portrait of the Author, the set complete, cloth, price £3. 13s. 6d.; or Roxburghe half-morocco, price £4. 7s. 6d.

*\*\*\* The handsomest Edition published.*

### THE AUTHOR'S EDITION,

IN SIX VOLUMES. Bound in cloth, 38s. 6d.

#### CONTENTS.

- Vol. I.—EARLY POEMS and ENGLISH  
IDYLLS. 6s.  
II.—LOCKSLEY HALL, LUCRE-  
TIUS, and other Poems. 6s.  
III.—THE IDYLLS OF THE KING,  
complete. 7s. 6d.

- Vol. IV.—THE PRINCESS and MAUD. 6s.  
V.—ENOCH ARDEN and IN  
MEMORIAM. 6s.  
VI.—QUEEN MARY and HAROLD  
7s.

*This Edition can also be had bound in half-morocco, Roxburgh, price 1s. 6d. per vol. extra.*

### THE CABINET EDITION,

COMPLETE IN TWELVE VOLUMES. Price 2s. 6d. each.

#### CONTENTS.

- Vol. I.—EARLY POEMS. Illustrated with  
a Photographic Portrait of Mr.  
Tennyson.

- II.—ENGLISH IDYLLS, and other  
POEMS. Containing an Engraving  
of Mr. Tennyson's Residence at  
Aldworth.

- III.—LOCKSLEY HALL, and other  
POEMS. With an Engraved  
Picture of Farringford.

- IV.—LUCRETIVS, and other POEMS.  
Containing an Engraving of a Scene  
in the Garden at Swainston.

- V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. With  
an Autotype of the Bust of Mr.  
Tennyson by T. Woolner, R.A.

- Vol. VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. Illus-  
trated with an Engraved Portrait of  
'Elaine,' from a Photographic Study  
by Julia M. Cameron.

- VII.—IDYLLS OF THE KING. Con-  
taining an Engraving of 'Arthur,'  
from a Photographic Study by Julia  
M. Cameron.

- VIII.—THE PRINCESS. With an En-  
graved Frontispiece.

- IX.—MAUD and ENOCH ARDEN.  
With a Picture of 'Maud,' taken  
from a Photographic Study by Julia  
M. Cameron.

- X.—IN MEMORIAM. With a Steel  
Engraving of Arthur H. Hallam,  
engraved from a picture in possession  
of the Author, by J. C. Armytage.

- XI.—QUEEN MARY: a Drama. With  
Frontispiece by Walter Crane.

- XII.—HAROLD: a Drama. With Frontis-  
piece by Walter Crane.

*\*\*\* These Volumes may be had separately, or the Edition complete, in a handsome ornamental case, price 32s.*

### THE MINIATURE EDITION,

IN THIRTEEN VOLUMES.

#### CONTENTS.

- Vol. I.—POEMS.  
II.—POEMS.  
III.—POEMS.  
IV.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.  
V.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.  
VI.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.

- Vol. VII.—IDYLLS OF THE KING.  
VIII.—IN MEMORIAM.  
IX.—PRINCESS.  
X.—MAUD.  
XI.—ENOCH ARDEN.  
XII.—QUEEN MARY.

VOL. XIII.—HAROLD.

Bound in imitation vellum, ornamented in gilt and gilt edges, in case, price 42s.  
This Edition can also be had in plain binding and case, price 36s.

*Spottiswoode & Co., Printers, New-street Square, London.*









